

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"BLACKSPOT" POLICY OF  
SOUTH AFRICA

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 122 which expressed the sense of the Congress that the Republic of South Africa cease its "blackspot" policy of removing black South Africans from their ancestral land and relocating them.

The spirit behind this legislation is embodied in the words of Saul Mkhize who was shot to death by the South African police while opposing the Government's attempt to force him to surrender land that his family had owned for three generations. "We do not wish to be rebellious in any way, but only to continue to live our lives in our own environment."

At this point, I would like to call your attention to an excerpt from an article on the South African Homelands policy which appeared in last weekend's New York Times Magazine section. Through horrifying statistics and startling facts, this article brings to light the callousness and injustice of the unconscionable apartheid system.

Our Government must let the Republic of South Africa know that the homelands policy is a flagrant abuse of the U.N. Charter and its covenant of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Failure to send a message of our Nation's continued commitment to the principles of human rights and human dignity would amount to a breach of faith with the freedom-loving people of the world.

The article follows:

MISERY IN A SOUTH AFRICAN "HOMELAND"  
(By Joseph Lelyveld)

When he rose to speak, the general was still wearing his cap, with the full complement of ornamental braid due his rank. Solemnly, he gave his undergraduate audience a rigid salute. The white, rosy-cheeked expressions turned up to him could not have been more earnest had they been in church. And the general easily slipped into an evangelist's role, depicting a conflict between forces of light and darkness. The former, it went without saying, were well represented in this lecture hall at the University of the Orange Free State in Bloemfontein, an Afrikaans-language citadel not noted for its tolerance of wayward ideas. The forces of darkness were the "terrorists," black South Africans manipulated by the "dragon" of international Communism. It was exactly what might have been expected in Bloem-

fontein, except for one conspicuous detail: The general, Xhanti Charles Sebe, Director of State Security of the supposedly independent "homeland" of Ciskei, was black.

More than pigmentation made him a surprising figure. A handful of young Afrikaners in the hall seemed uneasily aware that here was a black man who surpassed them in ideological commitment; from their point of view, he was almost too good to be true. The coiled energy and enthusiasm in the man came out in a gravelly voice and staccato articulation. When he spoke of "the devilish, destructive actions of trained terrorists," he squeezed off each syllable like a retaliatory shot.

The retaliation he threatened was more than mimetic. Scornfully, he dismissed the condemnation aroused last year by a South African military raid on houses used by the underground African National Congress in the tiny, internationally recognized black state of Lesotho. "Next time it will not be the South African defense force," he promised with what may have only sounded like bravado, given the fact that his fledgling army already had a unit in parachute training. The Republic of Ciskei—fourth among South Africa's 10 "homelands" to accept the ambiguous sovereignty that Pretoria offers its former tribal reserves as a way of diffusing the demand for black political rights—would "fight side by side with the Republic of South Africa," he vowed. With that, nearly all the white hands in the hall were clapping.

The young Afrikaners, reared in the dominant white group, had reason to applaud: For one evening, at least, Charles Sebe had turned the world's view of the South African conflict inside out, offering himself as proof that the conflict wasn't racial, that their system of partition and exclusion had black support. What seemed uncanny and, in Bloemfontein's perspective, unreal about this unabashed black militarist was his easy assumption of power. Here was a black man who (with the active sponsorship of the South African security police, in which he once served) had probably amassed more power for his own use within the structure of the apartheid system than any black before him.

"My President is prepared for any eventuality with his elite garrison of men," the general boasted, verbally genuflecting before Ciskei's "President for Life," his own elder brother, Lennox L. Sebe. He was trying to impress, but there was one eventually he obviously failed to contemplate until too late: Two months later—last July—he found himself behind bars in one of his own prisons, put there by his own brother.

Ciskei can be seen as a Zion for Xhosa-speaking blacks or as a backwater bailiwick for black opportunists. Either way, it has become a sinkhole of despair and social misery into which the white authorities continue to pour surplus blacks from adjacent white areas. This process—known euphemistically as "resettlement," bluntly as "removal," or cynically as "repatriation"—quickly nullifies the meager benefits of a few development projects. South Africa earns billions from its gold and other mineral exports, but

malnutrition and infant mortality rates in some of the resettlement camps are on a par with Bangladesh. About one in every four persons living within the territory's borders has been deposited there since 1970, when the population was half its present level of 700,000. And still the process—which is said to have moved more than two million blacks in South Africa as a whole—grinds on.

Against such a backdrop, the rise and fall of Charles Sebe may seem nothing more than an invitation to satire, a ludicrous episode in the chronicle of black mischief—and white mischief—that is being written in the black homelands. But, beyond satire, the feud between the Sebe brothers—which had its obscure origins in a fight between their sons and the indiscreet mention of a family secret that, after all, the two brothers did not have a common father—seemed to suggest that one of the key strategems of the updated and streamlined apartheid state might have definite limitations: its use of blacks to smother black protest. For when Lennox Sebe moved to ditch his brother, he discovered how much resentment had been aroused among his own tribal supporters by the miniature police state the general had been fashioning in the President's name. The very qualities that made Charles Sebe invaluable to the whites—his enthusiasm and instinct for power—made him a liability, and finally even a threat, to his filial senior partner.

Both South Africa's Foreign Minister and Police Commissioner tried to induce the President to restore the general to his position of command, but they were faced with a Catch-22 of their own devising: Lennox Sebe, a former preacher and school inspector who was subject to spells of depression, was, in their view—even if no one else really believed it—the head of a sovereign state.

Those—like the proponents of "constructive engagement" in the Reagan Administration—who have persuaded themselves that an evolutionary movement away from apartheid is gathering force in South Africa don't focus for long on the promotion of black satrapies like Ciskei. They look instead at the gains made by some urban blacks: Still disenfranchised, still pent-up in segregated ghettos and schools, they have been conceded, at least, limited rights as homeowners and members of trade unions. Those who contend that apartheid is merely getting a face lift point to the homelands as the fulfillment of the racial ideology of 30 years ago; they point to Ciskei and the Sebes not to show a forgotten offshoot of the Government's programs but their main thrust. The fact that both kinds of change go on simultaneously can be used to demonstrate either the deviousness or the confusion of the white regime. But it can hardly be denied that Ciskei—a wedge of territory about half the size of Connecticut, carved out of the eastern part of Cape Province as one of two Xhosa homelands—reveals the South African conflict in its starkest, rawest form.

Historically, it is South Africa's racial frontier and cockpit, the region where blacks and whites first met and clashed. Warfare between white settlers and Xhosa

tribesmen was endemic throughout the 19th century. But it is also the region where blacks and whites first mixed, where the urge for political equality was first felt and expressed, largely as a result of missionary schooling that shaped several generations of black leaders. Before the African National Congress was banned and forced underground 23 years ago, the eastern Cape was its acknowledged stronghold.

The other Xhosa homeland, found on the eastern side of the Kei River, is called Transkei. Between the two, there is a buffer running north from the Indian Ocean port of East London, seldom more than 30 miles wide, that is known as the "white corridor," after its 90,000 white inhabitants, whose interests were deemed to outweigh those of some 3 million Xhosa-speaking blacks to whom the entire southeastern part of the country could have been ceded had the white Government really intended to spawn a credible black state. The fact that the two Xhosa states are now regarded as sovereign has a weird payoff for all Xhosa-speaking blacks left in what is deemed to be South Africa: Under the country's laws, they can all be classed as foreigners, even those who have never set foot in Ciskei or Transkei; and if they want the vote, they can be told they already have it—"in your own country."

"My President has a philosophy," General Sebe informed me the first time I met him, a week before Ciskei was proclaimed independent on Dec. 4, 1981. "It is a philosophy of a meal a day." He was quoting a promise enshrined as the seventh point in President Sebe's 10-point program. "All problems start with starvation," the President later told me, elucidating his credo. "If you keep a man hungry for 12 hours, he will steal. If you keep him hungry for 24 hours, he will commit murder. So the first basic thing is to make a man have a meal."

In Ciskei, it is not always easy. My grant labor has long been the territory's only significant export. Now, as the need for jobs grows more desperate, their availability declines. A rural black who abides by the "influx control" regulations that South Africa has erected as a barrier has no opportunity to look for work, and no real choice about the job he takes when work finally becomes available.

"When I say there are 40 jobs to fill," a Ciskei magistrate said, "500 people turn up."

This damming of unemployment and discontent is general throughout the homelands, behind the pretentious facades rising in the new capitals, the luxury residences for their Cabinet ministers and the flashy casino hotels that are supposed to lure free-spending whites into the bush—all in the name of development and "self-determination." Taken together with the urban townships that have been gerrymandered into the black states, the homelands now hold about 53 percent of the total black population of more than 23 million on a mere 13 percent of the land the world knows as South Africa. Few white South Africans have ever heard of, let alone glimpsed, Phuthaditjhaba, Siyabuswa or Giyani, to name a few of the new homeland capitals being raised at extravagant cost. But their surrogates, the white officials who are responsible for the homeland system, are driven by a tautological article of faith: It must work because it has to work; otherwise, they tell themselves, they will be engulfed.●

## FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT CO. RECEIVES WELL-DESERVED RECOGNITION

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear of conflicts between utility companies and those they serve. We hear of reports that the utility is a bad corporate citizen and we hear complaints.

Florida Power & Light, with operations in my congressional district and throughout Florida, has just received a citation from the Department of the Interior in honor of their efforts to preserve wildlife in Florida. I reprint the citation here and urge all to take note of what a company can do when they set their mind to serving their customers, their State, and their nation. This wildlife protection program has been an enormous success and deserves the recognition it has received.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington.

CITATION FOR CONSERVATION SERVICE,  
FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

In recognition of contributions and services of direct, national significance to the missions of the Department of the Interior in the fields of research and preservation of endangered species.

The Florida Power and Light Company is a leader among public utilities and industrial entities in making compatible the needs of wildlife, upon whose habitats it must necessarily impinge, with its basic mandate to respond to the needs for electric power of a burgeoning population in the areas that it serves. This Company, the fourth largest utility in the Nation, has taken effective measures to protect the future of the several endangered and threatened species which occur in or adjacent to its properties through a program of accommodation to the needs of the affected species. Furthermore, it initiated in the early 1970's, a major and extensive research and management program for them. Where real or potential conflicts have been identified, the Company has taken positive actions to minimize adverse consequences and to work with government agencies to insure successful co-existence. The Company's efforts have had a major impact in assuring the continued survival of the Southern bald eagle, the West Indian manatee, the American crocodile, and several species of sea turtles. Florida Power and Light Company has expended both funds and effort in statewide public relations programs to protect the endangered Florida manatee. These efforts extend far beyond their corporate boundaries and involve their funding of Federal and state projects. The many initiatives undertaken by the Company in the careful and caring management of endangered species are characteristic of an organization that has a clear sense of stewardship and a genuine understanding of the role that corporations and governmental entities can share in preserving one of our most precious heritages, the Nation's wildlife. For the exceptional, positive steps that Florida Power and Light

Company has taken to assure the recovery of numerous endangered species, the Company is granted the Conservation Service Award of the Department of the Interior.

JAMES G. WATT,  
Secretary.●

## A BIPARTISAN STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recent statements by U.S. representatives to the U.N. followed by Senate approval of the Kassebaum amendment to cut U.S.-assessed contributions to the United Nations have provoked a national debate in this country over the value of the United Nations to U.S. national interests and the appropriateness of maintaining the United Nations headquarters in the United States.

President Reagan responded to that debate by addressing the United Nations General Assembly on September 26, 1983, at which time he praised the United Nations proud history of promoting conciliation and helping keep the peace, and pledged that the United States would uphold the original ideals of the United Nations. That was followed by statements from the administration in firm opposition to the Kassebaum amendment.

During recent hearings held by the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations on the U.S. role in the United Nations, a statement of support for the United Nations was submitted with the endorsement of an impressive bipartisan list of former Secretaries of State, national security advisers, and U.S. representatives to the United Nations. In light of its timeliness and importance, I commend that statement to the attention of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS: A STATEMENT OF  
SUPPORT

"The United Nations is an important instrumentality in the conduct of American foreign policy. Our experience, both in our public and private roles, has brought this home to us.

The United Nations provides this country with a forum for protecting and promoting our own interests as well as for seeking solutions to problems we share with other countries.

It is appropriate as well that this country should be the site of the United Nations, given the vision that has guided us as a nation and given the role we play, on all levels, in the world today.

We all recognize the shortcomings of the United Nations, but we live in a very imperfect and increasingly dangerous world and we must make the best use possible of whatever



means we have for managing the problems that beset us."

George W. Ball, Permanent Representative to the U.N.—1968.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Adviser—1977-1981.

McGeorge Bundy, National Security Adviser—1961-1966.

Arthur J. Goldberg, Permanent Representative to the U.N.—1965-1968.

Alexander M. Haig, Secretary of State—1981-1982.

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State—1973-1977. National Security Adviser—1969-1974.

Donald F. McHenry, Permanent Representative to the U.N.—1979-1981.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Permanent Representative to the U.N.—1975-1976.

Edmund S. Muskie, Secretary of State—1980-1981.

William P. Rogers, Secretary of State—1969-1973.

Dean Rusk, Secretary of State—1961-1969.

John A. Scali, Permanent Representative to the U.N.—1973-1975.

Brent Scowcroft, National Security Adviser—1975-1977.

William W. Scranton, Permanent Representative to the U.N.—1976-1977.

Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of State—1977-1980.

Andrew Young, Permanent Representative to the U.N.—1977-1979. ●

## RESPONDING TO THE KOREAN AIRLINES TRAGEDY

**HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 1983*

● **Mr. DANNEMEYER.** Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the shooting down of the South Korean airliner that had wandered over Soviet airspace all of us have been wondering what the United States should do to keep similar, or even worse, incidents from occurring in the future. In search of answers to that question, the Republican Study Committee held some hearings on September 16, at which participating members solicited the recommendations of a number of people well qualified to render knowledgeable suggestions. One of those who appeared to make recommendations was Mr. John M. Fisher, who is president of the American Security Council, an organization which has devoted much time in recent years to promoting peace through strength. Mr. Fisher's prepared remarks, which deal directly with this question of deterrence, are well worth our consideration for they come right to the point which is—words are not always enough to carry the day. Sometimes muscle is required to back them up and, at this time, we do not have the military muscle we should have vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

Since Mr. Fisher has spent a number of years analyzing U.S. defense policy, as well as the policies of the Soviet Union, his recommendations should

not pass unnoticed. I urge Members to reflect on them most seriously and, to that end, I ask unanimous consent that his September 16 remarks be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

I am honored to have the opportunity to testify before this Committee as you consider what the United States should do in the aftermath of the Soviet mass murder of the 269 innocent passengers aboard Korean Air Lines Flight 007 on September 1.

We are all saddened by this monstrous act. It has doubly affected all of us here today because of the loss of our friend Larry McDonald.

Larry McDonald dedicated his life to fighting the Soviets' ruthless expansion of their empire.

Even in his death, Larry McDonald has made a major contribution to freedom because this massacre and subsequent Soviet statements have brought a sharply increased public understanding that the Soviets will murder and lie when it suits their purpose.

During this period of heightened awareness, you and this Administration have the opportunity to gain acceptance for a new agenda in dealing with Communist expansionism.

But, this must be a long term agenda. Because we are militarily inferior to the Soviet Union, we are simply not in a position to take any action which would correct Soviet behavior in the short term.

In thinking about this, we need to remember that Soviet successes have been possible only because the United States has had neither a goal nor a strategy in this conflict. Instead of a strategy, the United States has had a policy of reacting to Soviet initiatives only when they are perceived as threatening vital United States national interests.

Now, the Soviets have gained a significant nuclear and conventional military superiority over the United States. This, together with the powerful Soviet world-wide propaganda and disinformation network promoting disarmament in the West, makes rebuilding our defenses an urgent necessity.

First, though, we should adopt a national goal in this conflict and a grand strategy based on all elements of our national power—economic, political, and military—to achieve that goal.

On June 8, 1982, before the British Parliament, President Ronald Reagan proposed that this goal should be "a world in which all people are at last free to determine their destiny."

To achieve that goal, President Reagan called for a "crusade for freedom" designed to "leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history" through a "global campaign for democracy."

In this connection, President Reagan declared that, "It is time that we committed ourselves as a Nation—in both the public and private sectors—to assist democratic development."

I believe that most Americans agree with the goal so eloquently expressed by President Reagan and will support the adoption of a national strategy of peace through strength to achieve that goal. We have been working with 139 other national organizations in the Coalition for Peace Through Strength for the adoption and implementation of this strategy.

As you know, the Peace Through Strength Resolution has been sponsored by 54 Senators and 195 Representatives and

has been referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Armed Services Committee.

President Reagan was an early endorser of this resolution and it appeared as the defense strategy of the 1980 Republican Convention platform.

The President has said that he will sign this resolution when it is passed by both Houses of Congress.

This resolution has been endorsed by Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of Defense; Gen. John Vessey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Powell Moore, Deputy Secretary of State for Congressional Relations; and Judge William Clark, National Security Assistant to the President.

This resolution has already been passed by 12 State legislatures.

Whatever the outcome of the conflict between Soviet totalitarianism and democracy, the result is sure to be "peace through strength." What is being decided now is whose strength and whose peace.

So, we urge that you work for early passage of the resolution. This will provide the general concepts and serve as a yardstick to measure individual programs.

Unless the United States speedily adopts such a strategy to coordinate its national security efforts, it is doomed to ineffectual policies, uncoordinated responses to Soviet aggression, and ultimately, a great growth in the power and influence of the Soviet Union.

And, we must act now to rebuild our military posture.

Passage of the Defense Authorization Bill yesterday does not send much of a signal to the Soviets. It will only slow down the rate at which the Soviets are increasing their military superiority over the United States. They are still spending three times as much as the United States on strategic forces—and have been for over a decade.

This ad, which we ran in the Washington Post and Washington Times on Wednesday of this week, shows the result of this dramatically different level of spending.

Senator John Tower, as a co-sponsor of the Peace Through Strength Resolution in the Senate explained the need for rebuilding our forces as follows:

"Democracy does not need military power to win the fight for the minds of men. Democracy needs nothing more than energetic advocates and a world political environment in which it can demonstrate its superiority."

"The key to a peace through strength strategy is to achieve our goals without armed conflict. To do this, we must deter the Soviets from starting a war."

"History shows that only superior war fighting capability can deter an aggressor. Forces that cannot win cannot deter."

"The United States can have a superior war fighting capability without the cost of across-the-board numerical superiority if it exploits advanced technology such as the cruise missile and space-based laser."

We must spend whatever is necessary to rebuild a superior war fighting capability. That is the most cost effective approach—deterrence is cheaper than war.

However, we need not wait until we have regained a superior war fighting capability to start rolling back Marxism-Leninism into "the ash heap of history."

You can start by working to reverse the vote on covert aid to the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters and, push for vastly increased aid—enough to throw the Communists off their beachhead on the North American

mainland! That is the kind of signal the Soviets will understand.

We also recommend that you do the same thing for the Freedom fighters in Afghanistan and Angola (after repealing the Clark amendment).

This will likely lead to victories in Nicaragua and Angola. Such a defeat of Communism is long overdue.

This would signal that the United States can be counted on as a reliable friend and would open up other opportunities to roll back Communism.

I believe that if you and this Administration take the lead, the majority of the American people would back you.

And, you would have organized support, for example, member organizations of the Coalition for Peace Through Strength have prepared a declaration of support for the Nicaraguan freedom fighters which urges vastly increased support so that they can win.

We are still gathering signatures, but already 135 national organizations have signed the declaration and have committed to work to an in defense of America project to counter the massive propaganda and disinformation campaign designed to get the United States to abandon its friends in Central America.

The signers include the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Teamsters Union, American Conservative Union and AMVETS.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has gone further, and will be raising money for Humanitarian/Truth aid for Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters.

We will soon launch a campaign to get 1,000,000 individual Americans to sign this declaration and become honorary Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters.

We congratulate you for your leadership in considering what can be done effectively.

We will continue to cooperate with you in every way possible.●

#### EQUAL PAY

### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, women workers in this country continue to be the victims of wage discrimination. Data from the Department of Labor attests to the pay inequity reality.

At the beginning of 1980, women had generally the same earnings relative to men that they had at the beginning of the 1970's. Women who work full time earn about 60 percent as much as men. Women workers with 4 or more years of college education had about the same income as men who had only 1 to 3 years of high school. Similarly women high school graduates employed full time had about the same income on average as fully employed men who had not completed elementary school. A recent study by Bailey & Burrell found that 7 years after graduating from Harvard Law School, 25 percent of men and only 1 percent of women were partners in law firms. The average salaries of graduates of Harvard School of Public Health were \$37,800 a year of men and

\$21,300 for women. The survey further analyzed Harvard graduates in other fields and found that women graduates had consistently lower salaries regardless of marital or family status. The study concluded that there was "convincing evidence that subtle biases continue to constrain the career development of many women."

The earnings of women relative to men are higher in most other industrial countries and have increased while the relative position of American women has declined. One reason for this is that women continue to constitute a large proportion of workers in lower paid, traditional jobs, such as clerical workers, service workers, and retail service workers. While studies have found that labor market factors account for some of the male-female earnings differences, the greatest contributing factor is attributable to institutional discrimination, especially job discrimination.

A recent decision in a Washington State lawsuit regarding equal pay for equal work brought by AFSME against the State has significant implications in the area of wage discrimination against women. What follows is a column by Judy Mann which appeared in the Washington Post. The article analyzes the implications of the Washington State decision.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1983]

#### EQUAL PAY

(By Judy Mann)

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees has won a major lawsuit against the state of Washington and put the legal concept of equal pay for work of comparable value on the map once and for all. The decision by a federal judge is the most far-reaching application to date of the principle that employers must give equal pay not only to people performing the same job but also to people performing different jobs that require similar effort and abilities.

The decision culminates a 10-year effort that began when the state AFSCME notified Gov. Dan Evans that a number of female state employees were being paid less than male employees even though their jobs were similar. Studies commissioned by Evans of predominantly male and female job classifications revealed that jobs held predominantly by women were paid about 20 percent less than jobs with the same rating points held predominantly by men. The job of a clerk typist, for example, received the same number of points as that of the warehouse worker but clerk typist were paid at 10 levels below warehouse workers. The difference meant that women earned about \$175 less a month than men in similar jobs.

In 1977, Evans requested \$7 million to begin remedying the pay inequity, but incoming Gov. Dixy Lee Ray dropped the request from her budget. AFSCME filed suit in July 1982, charging the state with violations of the Federal Civil Rights Act, the state's Equal Rights Amendment, and its civil service act, and asking for full implementation of comparable-worth salary increases and back pay. The trial began on Aug. 29 in Tacoma, Wash. before Federal

District Court Judge Jack Tanner. He ruled last Friday that the state government was guilty of pervasive wage discrimination against many of its female workers and set a second trial date of Nov. 14 to establish the compensation the state must pay.

Winn Newman, who argued the case for AFSCME, said the state has estimated compensation to be about \$600 million and he is estimating it to be closer to a billion dollars. About 17,000 people, including men, who are in the affected job categories will get relief.

Classified advertisements for male- and female-only jobs placed by the state in newspapers prior to 1973 were introduced by AFSCME as pivotal evidence of deliberate job discrimination. The ads established that the state had made a deliberate distinction between jobs for women and jobs for men. Jobs employing mostly women are always paid less, causing a systemic discrimination that persists to this day, according to Newman. "Men aren't going to go to those jobs because they don't pay enough," he says.

"I think the same device [of looking back at classified ads] is available against every large employer in the country," Newman added. "They all did it."

The statistics assembled in the course of the case were devastating: in comparing jobs of similar skill, effort and responsibility, AFSCME was able to demonstrate that the monthly wage dropped \$4.52 for every percentile increase in the number of women working in a job category. Evidence also showed that half of all job categories were exclusively male, and only 3.5 percent of the women employees worked in integrated jobs.

The conventional wisdom on comparable-worth cases has been that they are difficult to prove precisely because it is necessary to compare jobs that are different, although Newman points out that job evaluations constantly go on in labor relations. As a result, there has been relatively little comparable-worth litigation since the Supreme Court broadened pay equity claims to include jobs that are dissimilar in June 1981. Librarians in Fairfax County have begun the process and have filed charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The case against the state of Washington involved 3,000 job categories, far more than most employers have. It went to trial within 13 months and the trial was over in two weeks, which should set to rest the widespread belief that pay equity suits necessarily take years to litigate. AFSCME, which has a million members, including 400,000 women, plans to pursue similar cases against other state and local governments.

The Washington case is a model of how systematic wage discrimination came into being. But more significantly for the future, the suit is a model of how unions and women's organizations can use existing laws to destroy it.●

#### FINAL TRIBUTE TO JERZY BOJANOWSKI

### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my sad duty to pay my last respects to an outstanding citizen,



composer, conductor, and musician, Jerzy Bojanowski, who with his wife, Frances, made his home in Milwaukee for most of his life. Mr. Bojanowski was sent from Poland, where he had conducted the Warsaw Grand Opera and the Warsaw Philharmonic Orchestra, to the Chicago "Century of Progress" World Fair in 1932, to represent Polish music. He chose to remain in this country and became a citizen in 1937.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Maestro Bojanowski, who shared his love and gift for music with the entire world. It was an honor for me to join with his widow and his many friends and admirers at his funeral to give thanks for his life and to pray for his eternal rest.

As a tribute to Jerzy Bojanowski I would like to share with our colleagues the eulogy delivered at his funeral by Rev. Robert F. Mueller, as follows:

**FUNERAL EULOGY FOR JERZY BOJANOWSKI 1895-1938) CONDUCTOR, COMPOSER, MUSICIAN—DIED SEPTEMBER 10, 1983 FUNERAL SERVICES AT THE CHURCH OF THE GESU IN MILWAUKEE, WIS.**

(Given by Rev. Robert F. Mueller)

Dear Frances, Relatives of Jerzy and Friends. A common bond brought us together this evening in this great church. Most of us probably do not know one another, but we do have in common an acquaintanceship, a friendship and for those who knew him more than in passing, a love for Jerzy Bojanowski. We knew him as a fine human being, a humble gentleman, a conductor, a composer, a musician. We have come here because we want to commemorate his life, to pay our respects to him, to recommend his soul to a merciful and loving Lord, and hopefully by our presence to be of some comfort to his dear wife, Frances, who most of all feels the great loss of this man and will certainly continue to do so. She knew him not only as conductor and musician but experienced each day his gentle kindness. She enjoyed his happiness and successes and shared his sorrows and trials. We want to express our deep sympathy to her, asking the Creator of all who gave him to her for these many years also to give her consolation and strength in this time of trial and great loss. We ask that the Lord be with her in the difficult days and months ahead. Our prayers, Frances, are that God be with you and you may sense the warmth and support of His divine presence.

While the words said at a funeral Mass are often referred to as a eulogy, their prime purpose is not the praise of a human person but the glory of God the Creator and the Giver of every good gift and talent. May these words spoken this evening lead all of us to praise and glorify the Father because of his goodness and his gifts to his children.

God in His mysterious way has set a time of life for each of us—a time span short or long in which to ready ourselves for an eternity of happiness with Him. To ready ourselves he gives us various talents and opportunities to nourish, foster and cultivate these talents—talents which reflect in some small degree a perfection of the Creator. The development and use of our talents during our lifetime redounds to the glory of God, and is part of the way in which we ready ourselves to be taken into his presence. Their use is part of the task which he

gives us on earth. To Jerzy, born in the Ukraine of Polish parents where his father was director of a steel mill, God gave a very high degree of musical talent. Along with this talent He gave him loving and kind parents who could and did help him from earliest years to develop those talents. Music played an important part in his childhood days. As a small boy Jerzy played Beethoven sonatas for four hands with his mother. His good parents saw in him a potential concert pianist. This was not to be. One day the little boy was riding a small pony and he fell from it and injured his wrist. Because of this injury it was later decided that he should direct his talents toward conducting. He used to enjoy very much watching and observing conductors of band concerts, indeed he was fascinated by them. Thus conducting became his primary love in the development of his musical talents. To further his musical talents he was sent to various music schools. Among other places he studied at the academy of music in Warsaw and in Vienna. There in Vienna he had the opportunity to study under one of the then great teachers, Franz Schrecker. He was privileged to be in a small restricted class of just five students. Later as he continued to develop and use his talents he conducted orchestras all over the world. In Europe he conducted in Warsaw, Dresden and Cannes to mention a few. Many orchestras here played splendid concerts under his direction including the Chicago, Denver and Minneapolis orchestras. In 1932 he came to the United States and Chicago as a representative of Poland to the World's Fair and Jerzy conducted the Chicago Symphony Orchestra at that time. In Chicago he met Frances. It was a new life. He decided to make his home with her in the United States to her good fortune and ours. We have all been acquainted with some of his work here. For eleven years he conducted the Music Under the Stars programs and some time ago the Opera Halka at the Pabst Theater. Jerzy enjoyed success not only as a conductor but also as a composer. When he was director of the Opera Theater in Torun, Poland, the mayor asked him to compose a new melody to be sounded each noon from the tower of the city hall, reviving an ancient custom of music at the hour of noon, done in ancient times as now with a bugle. Jerzy's melody continues to be sounded from that tower in Torun each day. He loved carillon music. When Marquette University received its carillon built by the Packard Bell Foundry in Annecy France in 1967, Jerzy composed variations using the Marquette anthem as his theme. In 1973 for the 500th anniversary of the birth of the great Polish astronomer Copernicus, his carillon composition was chosen to commemorate that anniversary. Three of the poems of the Present Holy Father, Pope John Paul II were set to music by Jerzy. Even in recent years he continued to compose for carillon, and brought out a work, the first one for both carillon and voice. That music was performed at Marquette University in the very shadow of this church. These are but some of the highlights of the life and work of this fine gentleman. God has been praised and glorified by the development of these musical talents, and we thank Him for it. Great talents bring with them a great deal of joy but also of sorrow. Jerzy's life was a long symphony of the major keys of joy with an admixture of the minor keys of sorrow. In the last years he found it painful even to listen to symphonies because he was now deprived of the opportunity to conduct an orchestra of

his own—his first love as a musician. This made more difficult because of the decades of acclaimed successful conducting.

For a moment let us turn away from his musical talents to a few of the qualities God bestowed upon him as a fine person. He was always nicely attired, and his manners could indeed be described as courtly. That word is fitting both because he had such manners and interestingly enough it states on his birth record: son of a Polish nobleman. He had the ability to put others at ease in his presence. He was indeed a man of peace. In this regard I would like to quote his dear wife: "He filled me with such peace. All the trials and tribulations of the day seemed swept away when he was present. He brought such peace and tranquility. I was fortunate to have him by my side." Jerzy brought harmony not only to sounds of voice and instrument but to life itself, to his home life, to others. All who have visited him have experienced his kindness and gentleness. We thank the Lord for giving him these qualities, we honor him for developing these no less than his musical gifts. With all his world-wide acclaim and place in the public eye he remained a humble man. Now the last note in the symphony of his life has sounded, the conductor's baton lies still. We his friends ask the Lord that he continue to make music for the Lord in the mansions of heaven. May the director of the choirs of angels hand him the baton and let him conduct that heavenly chorus, for they are musicians who make no mistakes, know their music, and pay attention to the conductor. That would be a fitting reward. May the Lord, we ask this day bring him to join too the throng of angels and saints around the throne of God who sing their endless Holy Holy Holy Lord, God of hosts. Heaven and earth are filled with your glory. Hosanna in the highest."

We are reminded today that even should we live so long a life as Jerzy, we too shall one day hear that final trumpet call. The Lord will ask how we have followed the score of the Divine Conductor in the symphony of our own lives, if we have used our talents and played the right notes, how we have harmonized with others. As we commend the soul of Jerzy Bojanowski to the Divine mercy we ask the heavenly Father that we may all one day be in the great chorus of praise around the throne of God there to join our loved ones who have gone before us, to sing eternal praise of the Lord for His goodness and the gifts he has given us in our lives and in the lives of those like Jerzy to whom he has given special talents and gifts, and who have used them for his glory. Amen.●

## SOVIET CRACKDOWN ON DISSIDENTS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago today this body conducted a special order on "Soviet Jewry: An Assessment After KAL 007." At that time we expressed our concern that deteriorating relations with the Soviet Union would have a generally harmful effect on the treatment of Soviet Jews.

This past Sunday, October 16, a story titled "Soviet Crackdown on Dissidents Seen" appeared in the Washington Post. It was about the recent arrests and trials of human rights advocates and Jewish activists in the Soviet Union and stated that the arrests and trials "suggested that the authorities are mounting a new campaign to eliminate remaining stirrings of dissent." The story said, in part:

One of the factors undoubtedly contributing to this climate is a general Kremlin drive to tighten internal discipline. But diplomats say a related factor is the deeply strained relationship with the United States and Soviet fears that the international situation may get worse in the coming months.

One of the trials and convictions described was that of well-known Jewish dissident Josef Begun, who has been campaigning for 13 years for the right to emigrate to Israel. He was given the maximum sentence under the Soviet criminal code.

These are dark and threatening signs that the Soviet Union is indeed moving into an even harsher period of dealing with those who do not and cannot abide by the oppressive strictures of the Soviet Government.

Those of us fortunate enough to live in the free world have an increased responsibility to speak out on behalf of all those who long for freedom and for the right to live their lives as they want, where they want.

Let the Soviet Government know that we will not cease in our efforts to bring to the attention of the world their inhumane treatment of some of its citizens, and that we will not cease in our efforts to fight for the human rights of these people.

The entire Post article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1983]

#### SOVIET CRACKDOWN ON DISSIDENTS SEEN

(By Dusko Doder)

Moscow.—The recent arrests and trials of human rights advocates and Jewish activists have created a deepening chill here and suggested that the authorities are mounting a new campaign to eliminate remaining stirrings of dissent.

Western diplomats say official pressure is directed not only at Jews seeking to emigrate, adherents of certain religious sects and human rights activists but also at foreigners seeking contact with them.

One of the factors undoubtedly contributing to this climate is a general Kremlin drive to tighten internal discipline. But diplomats say a related factor is the deeply strained relationship with the United States and Soviet fears that the international situation may get worse in the coming months.

Yesterday, a court in Vladimir convicted veteran Jewish dissident Josef Begun on charges of producing and distributing anti-Soviet literature and sentenced him to seven years in jail and five years of internal exile.

Begun, 51, who has been campaigning for 13 years for the right to emigrate to Israel, was given the maximum sentence under Article 70 of the criminal code. The government news agency Tass covered the trial in Vladimir, about 150 miles northeast of

Moscow, and such publicity was presumably designed to warn other Jewish activists.

Dissident sources said that Begun's wife and son had been allowed into the courtroom only to hear the sentencing.

Begun, an electronics engineer, had been denied an exit visa on grounds that he had access to classified information. He already has served two periods of exile in Siberia since 1977 for "parasitism," and until his arrest last November, he was without work and earned a living by giving private Hebrew lessons.

Tass, quoting the indictment, said he had "systematically produced, spread and transferred abroad deliberately slanderous information about life in the Soviet Union on instructions from foreign subversive anticommunist centers."

[In Washington, the State Department deplored Begun's trial, saying it and other recent Soviet actions "call into question the Soviet Union's commitment to human rights."]

Earlier in the week, a Moscow court sentenced a member of an unofficial Soviet peace group to one year in jail and five years of internal exile.

Oleg Radzinsky, a 25-year-old student, was convicted Thursday on charges of spreading "during a number of years, both orally and in writing, slanderous allegations vilifying the Soviet state and social system," Tass reported.

In view of the fact that Radzinsky "deeply repented what he had done," he was treated more leniently. His trial, however, is likely to serve as a warning to other members of the unofficial peace group whose activities were embarrassing for the Kremlin.

Western reporters and diplomats were barred from both trials. The Soviet authorities refused a request by U.S. diplomats for permission to travel to Vladimir, which is an open city frequently visited by foreigners.

Diplomatic sources said that a Lithuanian Catholic priest, the Rev. Sigita Tamkevicius, is believed to have been tried in recent days. An advocate of religious freedom, he was a founder of the Catholic Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights.

Tamkevicius was arrested in May during the trial in Vilnius of the Rev. Alfonsas Svarinskas, another member of the committee, who was convicted on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and sentenced to seven years of internal exile and three years in a labor camp.

Dissident sources reported that a Latvian dissident, Ints Calitis, was recently tried and sentenced to six years in a labor camp on similar charges.

The crackdown on dissidents and Jewish activists seems to fit into tightening up all around that has been under way throughout the past year. The Soviet press is full of reports about trials of various persons on charges of "economic crimes."

The crackdown has been accompanied by a flurry of statements calling for greater ideological conformity and vigilance. A recurrent rationale for this has been the need to counter President Reagan's "crusade against communism" ●

#### BROADCASTERS PROJECTING PRESIDENTIAL WINNERS

#### HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. Au COIN. Mr. Speaker, since 1960, when television began reporting Presidential election returns while the polls were still open in the West, we of the West have suffered a systematic devaluation of our vote. It happened in 1964, and in 1972, and again in 1980.

This offends the essential fairness of Americans wherever they live. Nationwide, 71 percent of the respondents to a Los Angeles Times poll during November 1982 said that broadcasters should not project a Presidential winner until all polls are closed across the entire country. Eastern voters felt as strongly about this as we do in the West.

But let us face it. No one who votes east of the Rockies has ever experienced the feeling of hollowness that comes knowing absolutely that your vote does not matter. No Member east of the Rockies has seen mayors, sheriffs, commissioners, and State legislators doomed by early projections from 3,000 miles away.

This is a Nation in which—out of fairness—we will bar the public from a pretrial court hearing in order to protect a single accused person from prejudicial disclosures. Ironically, early election projections and the disclosure of regional results discourage hundreds of thousands of citizens from casting a vote for our most important office.

The bill which I am introducing today would assure Americans who live in the West that their votes in Presidential elections really count.

The bill provides a pragmatic, practical, and nonintrusive solution to the problem without incurring the problems which are present in other proposed bills.

Under this bill, Presidential election results would be withheld until 11 p.m. eastern standard time. The bill mandates that all polls close by that time, leaving a decision as to when the polls opens, and a possible closure prior to 11 p.m. eastern standard time, in the hands of the States.

Furthermore, it does not pose a first amendment confrontation, for it is clearly within the power of the Congress to regulate the conduct of a Presidential election.

Alaska would be the only State required by this proposal to alter its voting hours. The polls in Hawaii now close at 6 p.m., the local time equivalent to 11 p.m. eastern standard time.

Mr. Speaker, the influence of television projections has been addressed in bills introduced in the 87th, 88th,



90th, 91st, 92d, 93d, 94th, 95th, and 96th Congresses. Twice the Senate has passed legislation to make projections more difficult. None has passed the House. David Broder, the syndicated columnist of the Washington Post, has written:

I think those western viewers and listeners deserve to be taken seriously when they say it suits their psyches not to be told how the election came out until they have a chance to vote.

A vote is a precious thing to give, and to lose. In my section of the country, the will to vote is lost when voters, on their way to the polling places after work, are told how the election came out before they have a chance to vote. I believe we must restore meaningful voting and I am convinced it can be done without plunging into a constitutional confrontation over freedom of the press and speech.

The primary responsibility of the media on election day is to provide careful and accurate reporting of election results, augmented by meaningful and timely analyses. For television news, the need to be first at all costs has become paramount in the race for ratings and audience share. By making projections the mainstay of hour-by-hour coverage—during the wait for results—the networks have intruded upon the decisionmaking process and actually influenced electoral behavior.

Consider, for a moment, the examples of 1972 and 1974. In 1972, two television networks projected Richard Nixon the winner by 6 p.m. Pacific standard time. In the Pacific zone, 14.6 percent of the votes were cast after the projection. In 1974, with no national race to be decided or projected, the after 6 turnout in the Pacific zone rose to 19.2 percent of the votes cast.

Over the last few years, networks news executives have provided astonishing proof of their own self-serving myopia, and of the need for some form of legislative action. Far from acknowledging any responsibility for the postprojection decline in voter participation, the executive can not seem to locate a real problem of any significance.

William A. Leonard, president of CBS News, testified on June 10, 1981, that:

There is a perceived problem here—the perception among many voters in the west that turnout is affected by early projections. But whether that problem is in fact a real one is yet to be determined.

On ABC's behalf, Richard C. Wald testified that the network made "no presidential projection until polls have closed on a winning total of electoral votes." In such a view is no recognition that projections also discourage voters from participating in the resolution of State and local issues.

On April 1, 1981, William J. Small, president of NBC News, wrote to me and said he—

Would not assume that early election calls are necessarily discouraging West Coast voters from going to the polls. . . (The voting pattern of registered voters does not indicate that television had any noticeable impact in 1980.

In another April letter, Ernest Leiser, vice president for special events and political coverage at CBS News, told me of a CBS study showing that 14 percent of the registered voters had heard of the early projections "but only 3 percent said they did not vote" because of the projections or President Carter's concession.

Does it seem to bother CBS, Mr. Speaker, that 3 percent of the voters were deprived of the right to cast a meaningful vote? Three percent of the turnout in the five most directly influenced Western States is 359,175 voters, the equivalent of a city just about the size of Portland, Oreg. Personally, I believe the figure is much larger. A Field Institute survey found more than 400,000 registered California voters who did not vote because of the early projections and the concession speech.

But let us stick with CBS for a moment. Is CBS bothered by 3 percent? It does not seem so. Says Leiser:

The Reagan margin of victory in all the Western States was so wide as to have made the 3 percent a relatively insignificant factor.

There you have got it. The CBS study confirms that at least 3 percent are denied the right to cast a meaningful vote. But 3 percent of the voters are a "relatively insignificant factor" to CBS, and NBC has not yet found any indication that television had "any noticeable impact."

But listen to these executives carefully. Have the networks told us what societal purpose is served by making projections? They have not and they cannot, for projections serve no useful purpose to anyone except the networks. There is no need for this to continue.

As we all know, it is well within the state of the art for a network to base a projection solely on exit polling and precinct analyses. Advances in electronics and polling techniques will only shorten and intensify the election-night race at the networks. Unless we act, Americans who live in the Pacific time zone on election day, 1984, will probably learn even earlier in the afternoon who will be the President, regardless of how they intend to vote.

The proposal to prohibit the release of Federal election results by election officials does not appear to raise constitutional questions. The Constitution permits Congress to legislate to preserve the integrity of elections of Senators, Representatives, and the Presi-

dent, and to preserve the enjoyment of all rights of citizenship.

Nor would such a proposal restrict the coverage of news, the news media's right to report, or diminish the public's right to be informed. To the contrary, it would focus the attention of the media on a fast and accurate tally of actual votes immediately after the voting period had closed. This would eliminate confusion, and would do away with the influence of early projections. Then the media can use its exit polls and its precinct analyses to explain why voters voted the way they did.

These proposals clearly avoid a first amendment confrontation. When a broadcaster is granted the exclusive use of the airwaves, he accepts a series of obligations, which the Government enforces as overseer and ultimate guardian of the public interest. The first amendment serves to preserve an uninhibited marketplace for ideas, but the right of the viewers and listeners is paramount to the rights of the broadcasters. As the Supreme Court stated in *Columbia Broadcasting Systems Inc. against Democratic National Committee*:

Congress intended to permit private broadcasting to develop with the widest journalistic freedom consistent with its public obligation. Only when the interests of the public are found to outweigh the private journalistic interests of the broadcast will government power be asserted within the framework of the Act.

I urge you to heed the 1981 testimony of the League of Women Voters: election projections when polls are still open anywhere serve no positive purpose in the election process. I urge you to adopt the judgment that nothing more is involved in the projection game than a race for a competitive edge that satisfies nothing other than the private interests of the broadcaster.

I believe that part of the media's responsibility is to broadcast the results as soon as the results are made available. The question of when to make the results available is a determination of government. By postponing the release until all polls are closed, we can spare an entire region of the country a wrenching experience without damaging the unrivaled ability of radio and television to spread the word swiftly.

By withholding results until all polls are closed no one would be discomfited except the networks. Any additional cost caused by holding up release of the results for a few hours would be small price to pay to assure greater fairness and perhaps greater participation in an election. ●

# ANTISATELLITE WEAPON SETS DANGEROUS COURSE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, a recent article in *Science* magazine, the highly respected publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, criticized the development of the U.S. antisatellite (ASAT) weapon. This weapon, if deployed, is capable of destroying satellites in orbit. It has no obvious target save for the Soviet early-warning satellites, and in my opinion, the strategic implications, including potential abrogation of the ABM treaty growing out of ASAT activities, have not been seriously considered. Mr. Chairman, the article follows:

[From the *Science* Magazine, Oct. 14, 1983]  
ANTISATELLITE WEAPON SETS DANGEROUS COURSE

Within a month or two, an Air Force F-15 jet fighter will fly to a spot over the Pacific Ocean to test one of the most controversial new weapons in America's strategic arsenal: a compact two-stage rocket capped by a small metal cylinder. The purpose of the test is merely to demonstrate the fighter's ability to launch the rocket into outer space. But subsequent tests—to be conducted next year—are supposed to demonstrate the ability of the metal cylinder to ram and destroy critical Soviet military satellites orbiting up to 1200 miles or so above the earth.

The fruition of a 20-year research effort, America's new antisatellite weapon, or ASAT, is clearly one of the most sophisticated and threatening items in the Pentagon's repertoire. Unlike the crude nuclear-tipped ASATs deployed by the United States in the 1970's, the new ASAT will enable the Pentagon to destroy the space-based eyes and ears of the Soviet Union without causing any collateral damage to its own satellites in outer space. Its construction in effect marks the demise of the "open skies" doctrine first announced by President Eisenhower, in which U.S. officials maintained that outer space was a sanctuary from which the superpowers could keep tabs on each other for the purpose of ensuring world peace.

Despite the obvious strategic implications of the new ASAT, it remains one of the most closely guarded subjects of Pentagon research. Although the outlines of the ASAT program have by now become well known, its precise military goals have been carefully obscured by a shifting series of official statements and a curtain of Pentagon secrecy. Employees of the U.S. Air Force, which manages the ASAT program, have been specifically barred from releasing any information about the ASAT's development, testing, and capabilities. Even the House and Senate Armed Services Committees have paid scant attention to the ASAT in recent years, and any substantive information they turned up has been carefully excised from the public record.

As a result, the Pentagon has been able to complete much of its work on the program unimpeded by any informed public debate. Thus far, the government has spent roughly

\$1.5 billion on the ASAT and related reconnaissance and communications equipment. By 1987, when 28 of the weapons will first be ready for use by a squadron of F-15's, this amount will have swelled to at least \$4.5 billion. Because the Defense Department must assume that the Soviets will respond to the U.S. ASAT by improving their own ASAT capability, it also plans to spend at least \$1 billion a year over the next few years to try and ensure that U.S. satellites remain immune to the enhanced Soviet threat.

Three general themes can be discerned in the Pentagon's shifting public defense of these expenditures. First, there is the uncomplicated explanation that because the Soviets have an operational antisatellite weapon, the United States must also have one. Absent this parity, how can the Soviets be expected to bargain seriously at talks designed to ban ASATs on both sides? This was a popular argument during the Carter administration, as illustrated by a 1978 White House statement on space policy. "While the United States seeks verifiable comprehensive limits on antisatellite capabilities, in the absence of such an agreement, the United States will vigorously pursue development of its own capabilities," the statement said.

Under the Reagan administration, in contrast, there has been little interest in banning ASATs and the program's directors have attempted to rewrite history by denying that the ASAT was ever approved to foster arms control negotiations. "Our ASAT development program, contrary to . . . misconception, has never been a 'bargaining chip' for arms control," says Richard DeLauer, the under secretary of defense for research and engineering. Robert Cooper, the director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, agrees with DeLauer and insists that the ASAT was devised as a means of destroying Soviet satellites that pose a threat to ships in the U.S. Navy. "Up until a few years ago . . . we were willing to fight all battles with the Soviet Union leaving their spacecraft in a sanctuary," he told Congress last March. "It was not until the use of the Soviet low earth orbiting satellites and their ocean surveillance capabilities, that we began to feel those spacecraft were so threatening to our forces in their ability to target . . . ground-based, airborne, and subsurface assets to attack those ships, that we realized we probably should have an antisatellite capability."

Cooper was talking about the four satellites presently orbited by the Soviets to keep track of U.S. aircraft carriers and other large ships. Two, which use radar, are of the type that achieved wide notoriety in recent years by accidentally falling to earth and leaving bits of its nuclear power plants strewn over the Canadian countryside. The other two use passive sensors to detect electronic emissions at sea. The fear is that both will be used to direct the fire of nearby conventional Soviet forces, and the intention is that the United States would use its ASATs to destroy them in the early stages of a conflict.

The attack would probably be initiated at McChord Air Force Base in Seattle, Washington, where one of the first ASAT-equipped F-15 squadrons is scheduled for deployment. Tracking data from U.S. optical and radar satellite sensors located in the Philippines and Hawaii, and on Kwajalein Island, will be analyzed by computers at the Space Defense Operations Center in Colora-

do, and the attack coordinates will be relayed to the F-15's, probably in midflight. A sophisticated computer on board the ASAT will instruct the pilot on the appropriate flight plan and signal when the missile should be released. Powered by an efficient solid-fueled engine, the missile will accelerate into outer space, reaching the incredible speed of 8 miles a second.

When the rocket fuel is exhausted, the initial stages will drop away and a metal cylinder measuring 12 by 13 inches will home in on the target using a cryogenically cooled infrared sensor. During its brief flight, the cylinder will navigate by firing a ring of thrusters around its mid-section in a sequence commanded by the computer. Only minutes elapse from launch to satellite intercept. If these ASATs should for some reason fail, another squadron of ASAT-equipped F-15's based in Langley, Virginia, will get a second shot moments later.

This, at least, is how the ASAT weapon works in theory. The Vought Corporation and the Boeing Aerospace Corporation, its principal manufacturers, have repeatedly encountered technical difficulties, which have forced a series of delays in the expected date of the first operational test. The troubles have also at least doubled the program's cost since the late 1970's, according to congressional sources.

Assuming that the ASAT can eventually be made to work, there still remain serious doubts about the usefulness of knocking out Soviet ocean reconnaissance satellites during the superpower conflict. First, there is some skepticism, both inside and outside the Pentagon, about the ability of the Soviet satellites to perform as advertised. Noel Gayler, a retired Navy admiral who became familiar with the Soviet ocean reconnaissance systems as a commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific and as a director of the National Security Agency, says that information from both active radar and passive electronic satellites "can be ambiguous. In addition, the difficulty of correlating the two is great and the countermeasures against them are fairly straightforward."

There is also the question of whether it matters if the Soviet satellites are able to perform their targeting task. Stated more directly, in the event of a global nuclear conflict is survival of the surface Navy relevant to national security? Adequate retaliation can be accomplished by land-based missiles, submarines, and long-range bombers. Gayler pauses before addressing this question to note that he devoted 15 years of his military career to service with naval carrier groups at sea. "In the event of a general nuclear war," he says, "on this scale, what happens to a carrier group is not a big concern." Why, then, is the Defense Department so concerned? "It's almost a knee-jerk reaction," Gayler says. "Whenever the Soviets do something, we have to do one thing better."

A third Pentagon defense of the ASAT program is that it will deter the use of ASATs by the Soviets, by permitting the United States to threaten a tit-for-tat response to destruction of its satellites in a conflict that falls short of a global nuclear war. Kent Stansberry, a physicist who works on ASAT issues in the Defense Department's strategic arms control policy office, says that he can envision a hypothetical scenario in which U.S. forces are fighting a Soviet-backed regime in, say, Africa or the Middle East. In such a conflict the United States could deter an attack on its



critical low-altitude photoreconnaissance and weather satellites only by threatening to respond in kind against similar Soviet satellites, he says.

Scenarios such as these assume first that the Soviet ASAT is effective and reliable enough to ruin U.S. low-altitude satellites—a doubtful assumption according to experts inside and outside the Pentagon. The system consists of a huge explosive device that sits atop a 150-foot booster rocket, which can only be launched from a missile base at Tyuratam, in the southwest corner of the Soviet Union. One version uses radar, another uses an infrared sensor. Both orbit the earth several times and then destroy the target by exploding nearby. Neither is highly accurate and both may be subject to simple countermeasures such as spoofing, jamming, and maneuvering. In 1979, for example, General David Jones, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, characterized the Soviet ASAT as follows: "Our general opinion is that we give it a very questionable operational capability for a few launches. In other words, it is a threat that we are worried about, but they have not had a test program that would cause us to believe it is a very credible threat." More recent Soviet tests have been characterized as almost uniformly unsuccessful by Nicholas Johnson, a Defense Department consultant on Soviet satellite systems.

Stansberry's scenario for potential Soviet ASAT use also assumes that destruction of U.S. photoreconnaissance and meteorological satellites would seriously degrade the effectiveness of conventional U.S. forces. This viewpoint is challenged by several weapons consultants including Richard Garwin of IBM. If the satellites were destroyed, he says, "we would not be without information." The United States could simply launch meteorological sounding rockets and missiles with high-speed cameras or radars on board. "If it cost you a million dollars per flight and you had to do this for 100 days it would be nothing," he says, compared with losing an Army division. Robert Buchheim, a former chief scientist for the Air Force, who also served as deputy assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, agrees that use of such shortduration rockets, balloons, and aircraft would eliminate "the benefit to the Soviet Union from destruction of those satellites."

Stansberry also makes a questionable assumption that the United States would not regard the destruction of its satellites as a provocation requiring more than a response in kind. Garwin, for example, says that he doesn't see "any way that a shooting war in space would be limited to space. It would extend to earth: to [the F-15] aircraft, to the launching sites of the [Soviet] antisatellite missiles." Everyone agrees that if a space war escalated into a more serious nuclear battle, the information provided by low-altitude U.S. satellites would be completely irrelevant.

If all of the standard public justifications for the U.S. ASAT seem illogical, then a question remains about why it is being developed. By a process of elimination, experts such as John Pike of the Federation of American Scientists speculate that one of the ultimate motivations behind the ASAT program is a desire by American strategic planners to target Soviet early warning and military communication satellites, both needed to guarantee adequate retaliation in the event of a preemptive U.S. attack. At present, the Soviets have 17 or so such satel-

lites, all in highly eccentric Molniya orbits, with the perigee over Antarctica and the apogee over the Northern Hemisphere. Satellites in such an orbit can achieve the same or similar results as those in geosynchronous orbit, for much less cost. But their low perigee makes them highly vulnerable to a limited range ASAT weapon such as that under development by the Pentagon.

Defense officials point out that according to present unclassified plans, the U.S. ASAT will be unable to reach Soviet early warning and communication satellites, due to the limited combat radius of the F-15 squadrons based in Washington and Virginia, as well as the limited range of the existing ASAT booster. This could be changed with only slight additional effort, however. The easiest of several options would be simply to station airborne tankers in the Pacific for inflight refueling so that the existing ASAT squadrons are able to reach the Southern Hemisphere; alternatively, the squadrons themselves could be stationed somewhere in the Southern Hemisphere (a few experts have remarked on the suitability of the Falkland Islands). Another option would be to modify the F-14, which is based on U.S. aircraft carriers, so that it, too, can carry the existing ASAT, and then deploy the carriers in the Southern Hemisphere.\* A third option is to extend the range of the ASAT itself. Stansberry notes that this problem "is not so much technical as financial." The Pentagon has already determined that it would cost \$1 billion to \$2 billion for a better air-launched booster rocket and \$2 billion to \$6 billion to adapt a long-range Minuteman or Trident booster.

Although potentially expensive or operationally difficult, the benefits of targeting Soviet early warning and military communication satellites are substantial. Deprived of an early look at a U.S. attack, the Soviets could have less than 15 minutes to prepare for retaliation and then encounter enormous difficulties in transmitting orders to its forces stationed around the globe. One Air Force officer who asked to remain anonymous noted that destruction of early warning satellites by either side would in particular "provide an excellent cover for a limited nuclear strike." When the Joint Chiefs of Staff described the technical requirements for the U.S. ASAT in a highly classified document in 1981, they specified that the ASAT be capable of destroying these key Soviet satellites. This requirement was until recently concealed, and references to it in the open literature are somewhat oblique. In recently declassified congressional testimony, however, the Air Force responded to criticism of the ASAT's short range by noting that "the Secretary of Defense has chosen to apply available resources to only a subset of the JCS document at this time. [We] continue to evaluate systems which would provide a higher altitude capability should the Soviets begin deployment of [deleted] satellites in higher orbits."

The Air Force is already taking steps to increase its capability to locate and track Soviet high-altitude satellites. A series of electrooptical cameras, located in Korea, Hawaii, on an island in the Indian Ocean, and in New Mexico, has been upgraded to permit surveillance of objects as high as 30,000 miles above the earth, and to provide instantaneous information to the Space Defense Center in Colorado. Radars in North Dakota and on Kwajalein Island in the Pacific have been modified to complement these cameras. And a series of probes has been launched from a missile range in

White Sands, New Mexico, to gather background information on starlight and heated space dust, in preparation for the potential launch in the late 1980's of four advanced infrared tracking and surveillance satellites. Rockwell International, Aerojet-General, the University of Arizona, and A. D. Little are collaborating on development of the components of the satellites, which are designed particularly for tracking Soviet satellites in Molniya and geosynchronous orbits. The estimated cost is at least \$2.2 billion.

The U.S. ASAT looks at first glimpse like a collection of sophisticated hardware without any place to go. Potential uses listed by the Pentagon are discredited as strategically unnecessary and irrelevant by independent military experts who have been following the program closely. If the real goal is to destroy the sensors that would warn the Soviets of a U.S. attack, the ASAT has the potential to disrupt the present formulation of deterrence; continued ASAT development therefore seems likely to launch the country on a highly uncertain strategic course.

—R. JEFFREY SMITH.●

## 85 YEARS OF MUSIC: THE GEORGE SUEFFERT BAND PLAYS ON

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, last week, the George Sueffert band closed out another successful season of free public concerts, first provided to the New York City public 85 years ago. Back then, George Sueffert, Sr., led the band.

My good friend, the younger George Sueffert took over as conductor in the depression years, and has brought great classics to the people of New York ever since. Millions have enjoyed the performance of the "Music Man" and his band. The following article in the New York Daily News tells the story of a man whose love of music spread throughout the community, and whose devotion to a tradition started by his father spurred him on to find private sources of funding when city funding was cut during the depression.

The article follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 9, 1983]

THE BAND PLAYS ON—FOR YEARS

(By William Neugebauer)

George Sueffert will be thinking of the circular lid of an old milk bottle and the overtures he'll be making to business leaders to drum up sponsors for the 1984 season as he raises the baton this afternoon for the 40th and final performance in the latest string of free public concerts the famed Sueffert Band has given for the past 85 years.

Hailed as the city's own "Music Man" and distinguished for his role in entertaining legions of residents and visitors with concerts at the Forest Park Music Grove for more than half a century, the 71-year-old, silver-haired maestro sees a certain harmony in

today's dank economic climate and the dark days of the Great Depression that gave rise to the first commercially sponsored free concerts in the city's history.

In 1933, a time of unparalleled nationwide unemployment, when soup kitchens and bread and milk lines dotted city neighborhoods, New York City abandoned its support of the free public concerts launched here 39 years earlier by Seuffert's late father, George Sr. The elder Seuffert had organized the band in Brooklyn as the Concordia Military Band and it became known as the George Seuffert Band four years later because of its immense popularity with audiences.

The little cardboard lip covering the glass milk bottles of the time sparked an idea in the younger Seuffert's mind and planted the seed of ongoing commercial sponsorship.

Now, that sponsorship includes financial supporters that include banks, insurance firms, labor groups, politicians, private citizens and various levels of government, including the city, which restored partial funding during the Wagner administration.

Seuffert recalled in his Douglaston home recently how, seeking his first corporate "angel," he approached officials of the now-defunct Grand View Dairy on Metropolitan Ave. in Ridgewood.

Surely, he argued, the free Seuffert Band concerts could enhance the dairy's public image and fatten its coffers. Company officials liked the idea but questioned just how they could link their product with the melding of Victor Herbert medleys and such heavy stuff as the "Knightsbridge March" from the London Suite by Eric Coates.

Seuffert, then a music teacher in the city schools system, slept on the matter that night and awoke with the idea of an admission ticket printed on the inside flap of the cardboard lid.

The dairy folks didn't sour on the notion. Actually, they found it sweeter than cream. The first printed lid, bearing the company's name, represented an admission ticket to a free Seuffert Band concert in Grover Cleveland High School in Ridgewood the night of June 27, 1933.

The dairy, along with the cardboard lids, eventually went the way of the old glass milk bottles, but the use of commercial sponsorship stuck, and now, Seuffert will be redoubling his efforts until the start of the '84 concert series next June humming his familiar tune through the canyons of business and industry.

Today's final concert, scheduled for 3 p.m. at Msgr. Mulz Auditorium at 88th St. and Jamaica Ave. in Woodhaven. Admission is, of course, free and the program, Seuffert said, will be a mixed bag of works requested by audiences down the year, including the overture from Wagner's "Flying Dutchman," Tchaikovsky's "Pathetic Symphony" and a group of Strauss waltzes, among others.

"Sponsors in the corporate sector, despite economic belt-tightening, realize benefits from the free concerts not only in terms of good will but even more concretely, as with the thousands of people who use their products and services," he advised. "And the proof of that may be seen in the number of sponsors who sign up year and again."

The oldest of four children, Seuffert gradually took over as the band's conductor in the early 1930s, but his father observed the group's anniversary every year by appearing as guest conductor at the Sunday performance closest to his birthday—Aug. 22, 1875.

He died in 1964, and his son, who had been playing in the band since 1928, continues to mark the anniversary by presenting a special concert on the Sunday closest to his father's birthday.

In 1979, the City Council renamed the Forest Park Bank Shell the George Seuffert Sr. Band Shell as a memorial to Seuffert's father, who had operated a music store on Knickerbocker Ave. in Ridgewood at the time he founded the band with 18 musicians.

The band now numbers 46, but its members no longer sport the uniform of military cut that accompanied the stirring strains of John Philip Sousa in bygone days. Now they wear dark suits and white shirts.

A living legend in his own right, the surviving Seuffert has been a familiar face around City Hall for nearly two decades, serving Mayor Koch and his predecessors, Abe Beame and John Lindsay, as the city's unpaid music consultant.

On Dec. 19, 1981, Koch presented the prestigious LaGuardia Medal to Seuffert as an "outstanding New Yorker." The only previous recipient of the medal was legendary newsman Walter Cronkite.

Seuffert, who began piano lessons when he was 8, was 16 years old when he first conducted the band at Forest Park. Last Aug. 21, he led the band for its 85th anniversary concert and got a little help.

Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-New York) wielded the baton for Sousa's "Comrades of the Legion," and his father, Armand P. D'Amato Sr., tinkled the ivories for that work.

The oldest of four children, Seuffert was graduated in 1929 from Bushwick High School, Brooklyn, where he later taught music and organized the school's first orchestra. It was that year that he wrote his first march, "Garity Post March," and two years later penned, "The Spirit of the Mall." He conducted the Goldman Band when the latter composition was first played.

The band still plays classic works, reflecting the kind of program presented at its founding, but today the repertoire has been expanded to include many delightful variations and themes.

"There's a much greater variety, running the gamut from symphonic to jazz," Seuffert said. "We have an exceptional Dixieland unit, so it's not unusual for listeners to hear Wagner's 'Entrance of the Gods into Valhalla' and 'The Sheik of Araby' on the same program." ●

#### UNEMPLOYED AND UNPROTECTED: A REPORT ON THE STATUS OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the Center on budget and Policy Priorities documents the failure of the current unemployment insurance system. The center's report shows that the percentage of unemployed workers receiving unemployment insurance benefits fell to an all-time record low in September. Only 32.8 percent of the unemployed re-

ceived benefits in September. More than 2 of every 3 of the unemployed—6.6 million American workers—were not collecting unemployment benefits. By comparison, in the 1975 recession, 73 percent of the unemployed received benefits—more than double the percentage now receiving them. These results are based on Labor Department data.

This situation would be more tolerable if these 6.6 million American workers and their families had somewhere else to turn. But for many of them this is not the case. The report notes, for example, that even if a family with both parents present is impoverished, in over half the States it is ineligible for welfare or Medicaid coverage.

The most obvious policy conclusion is that much more needs to be done to help the unemployed. The House has recognized this need by passing important legislative initiatives to aid the victims of the recession. The Senate and Reagan administration need to look beyond the headlines of the economic upturn, recognize the problems of the unemployed that remain, and concur with these House actions.

More specifically, the Federal supplemental compensation extension bill remains locked in conference. The Senate compromise supported by the administration does not contain a reachback provision. As a result, individuals who have exhausted their unemployment benefits prior to October 1 would not be eligible for much-needed assistance. The House conferees should insist on maintaining the basic tenets of the FSC extension bill as it passed the House overwhelmingly in late September.

In the coming months, Congress should also address the need for a comprehensive reform of the unemployment system. A new approach which reaches more of the unemployed requires our serious consideration.

A summary of the center's study follows. It provides a very concise description of the causes and extent of the failure of the unemployment insurance system.

#### UNEMPLOYED AND UNPROTECTED: A REPORT ON THE STATUS OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Since 1981, unemployment has risen to levels higher than at any time in the last forty years. Over the same period, however, the percent of unemployed individuals who receive unemployment insurance (UI) benefits has fallen sharply. In September 1983, according to data issued today by the Labor Department, the percentage of unemployed workers collecting UI benefits fell to an all-time record low. In September, only 32.8 percent of all jobless workers in this country collected unemployment benefits. Some 6.6 million unemployed American workers were without any unemployment benefits.

The record low in the percentage of unemployed receiving benefits comes in a month with some of the highest unemployment in recent U.S. history. At 9.3%, unemployment



in September stood higher than in any other month in the past 40 years, with the exception of the period from April 1982 through August 1983. Although September's unemployment level comes amidst a period of recovery, it is still higher than the unemployment level in the worst month of the 1974-1975 recession or any previous recession since the onset of World War II.

In previous recessions, however, far more jobless workers received protection from the unemployment insurance system. In 1975, the year when the previous recession hit bottom, 78% of all unemployed received unemployment benefits. This is more than double the percentage now receiving benefits.

In times of severe economic dislocation when securing work has been especially difficult, public policy has generally sought to cushion the economic burden placed on jobless workers. More rather than less protection has been given to the unemployed during recessions. The nation's current experience with unemployment insurance represents a departure from past tradition, because rather than provide benefits for the majority of jobless, the current unemployment insurance system is now providing protection to an historically low fraction of unemployed workers.

#### WHY UNEMPLOYMENT COVERAGE HAS CONTRACTED SO MUCH

There are two basic reasons why unemployment coverage has fallen to such low levels: (1) budget reductions in unemployment insurance proposed by the Reagan Administration and enacted by Congress in 1981, and (2) the duration of the current recession and the consequent high number of those who have been unemployed for long periods of time.

To examine how these two factors have affected unemployment insurance coverage, it is necessary to understand the basic workings of the unemployment insurance system. The system now consists of three pieces: a regular state unemployment insurance program, a joint federal-state extended unemployment benefit program, and a federal supplemental compensation program.

The regular state program pays benefits (for up to 26 weeks in most states) as long as an unemployed worker is still out of work and looking for a job. In addition, in the past, when unemployment rates became high relative to historical levels, the federal-state extended benefit program would be activated. This would provide benefits of up to thirteen additional weeks to jobless workers who had exhausted their 26 weeks of regular state benefits and continued to search for work. Extended benefits would become available on a state-by-state basis, depending on the level of unemployment in each state.

However, in 1981, as part of the Reagan Administration's effort to cut back on federal funding of domestic programs, major changes were made in unemployment insurance legislation that severely restricted the circumstances in which extended unemployment benefits can be paid. The result of these changes has been to virtually eliminate the extended benefit program at the present time, despite continuing high levels of unemployment. In September, with unemployment levels that most observers would consider quite high by historical standards, only two states in the country—West Virginia and Louisiana—could provide benefits to unemployed workers under the extended benefit program. In numerous states with double-digit unemployment,

such as Michigan with 13.6% unemployment and Ohio with 11.5% unemployment, the extended benefits program has been shut down.

The third piece of the unemployment insurance system is the federal supplemental compensation program. During times of recessions and high unemployment, Congress has generally acted to supplement the regular and extended unemployment benefits program by enacting a temporary program to provide additional weeks of benefit coverage to those who have used up all other unemployment benefits.

In past recessions, the supplemental benefits were added to the regular and extended benefits, so that in 1975, for example, unemployed workers received up to 65 weeks of coverage. In the current recession, however, the federal supplemental compensation program does little more than act as a replacement for the extended benefits program that was largely dismantled by the 1981 budget reductions. (The federal supplemental compensation programs adds 8-14 weeks of benefits coverage, depending on the state.) As a result, in 43 states, a total of only 34-38 weeks of unemployment benefits are provided, although unemployment levels are now higher than they were in 1975.

#### LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT

The other main factor resulting in the shrinkage of unemployment insurance coverage is the large number of "long-term" unemployed—those who have been out of work more than half of a year and are still looking for a job.

The current recession has been characterized by steep increases in the number of long-term unemployed. From December 1981 to December 1982, while the unemployment rate rose from 8.8% to 10.8%, the number of long-term unemployed more than doubled, jumping to 2.6 million. Since December, the onset of economic recovery has failed to make a significant dent in the number of long-term unemployed. Although the unemployment rate has dropped from 10.8% to 9.3% during this time, the number of long-term unemployed has fallen only marginally—from 2.6 million to 2.5 million.

Many of the long-term unemployed receive no unemployment benefits because all available benefits have been used up (especially since extended unemployment benefits are no longer available in most states).

#### WHAT HAPPENS TO THOSE WHO HAVE EXHAUSTED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

For many of the long-term unemployed who use up their weeks of unemployment benefits and are terminated from the program, there is not much of a safety net remaining to protect them from substantial economic hardships. In over half the states, unemployed families in which both parents are present are ineligible for welfare aid, even if the family is impoverished. In most of these states, unemployed two-parent families are also ineligible for any Medicaid coverage for themselves and their children, no matter how low their income is. If these families' income and assets are low enough, they may qualify for food stamps. However, food stamp benefits now average less than \$10 per person per month (46 cents per person per meal) and hardly constitute a safety net by themselves.●

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO LECH WALESA

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1983

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the selection of Lech Walesa as the recipient of the 1983 Nobel Peace Prize was received with acclaim throughout the free world. In honoring him the Nobel Committee also honors the people of Poland, workers, farmers, students, writers and artists, who, under his leadership and inspiration, pressed without violence or bloodshed for long-denied human rights. In recognizing the contributions of Lech Walesa, the Nobel Peace Prize gives hope to millions of oppressed people throughout the world that their silent struggle and determination for freedom and individual human dignity is recognized and supported by freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, Lech Walesa amazed the world with his accomplishments and stands as an example to all those who strive to resolve major problems through negotiation rather than conflict. He earned this distinguished award in his own right, through self-sacrifice, determination, and a commitment to the highest principles of service to his fellowman. Yet, he receives it also as a symbol of all those who diligently labor toward peaceful solutions to differences between nations and between people and their governments.

In avoiding the use of force, Lech Walesa spared countless thousands of his fellow-citizens from needless violence and bloodshed and indeed, made a major contribution to world peace.

Mr. Speaker, as one who gave his unequivocal support to the selection of Lech Walesa for the Nobel Peace Prize, I am happy to extend to him and to the people of Poland who have suffered for human rights with him my sincerest congratulations. May his and their sacrifices not be in vain! Sto Lat!●

#### THE DEPARTURE OF SISTER GLADYS MARIE

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month Sister Gladys Marie, CSC, will be leaving her post as administrator and chief executive officer of Saint Agnes Medical Center in Fresno, Calif., to assume new duties as administrator of Mount Carmel Medi-

cal Center and Mount Carmel East Hospital in Columbus, Ohio.

With her departure from Fresno, Sister Gladys Marie ends 11 years of outstanding contributions in helping to meet the health care needs of the San Joaquin Valley of California.

During these 11 years, Sister Gladys Marie has been responsible for the development of numerous programs at Saint Agnes Medical Center. She arrived in the midst of a heated controversy over a proposal to move the hospital from its location in downtown Fresno to its present site in the northern part of the city.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, she has been involved in the expansion of the new hospital by another 100 beds, developed the valley's first adult open heart surgery unit in 1976, was involved in the development of a hemodynamic care unit, and of the first cardiac rehabilitation program and comprehensive arthritis unit in the San Joaquin Valley.

Sister Gladys Marie was also responsible for forming the valley's first hospice program, which has stimulated the development of other hospices throughout the valley. That program now serves some 60 and 65 terminally ill patients and their families per month.

To further extend the hospital's healing ministry, Sister Gladys Marie began reaching out to the poor and frail of the community through free health screenings at two churches on Fresno's west side, and at Poverello House, a downtown facility serving Fresno's street people.

The opening of a Total Life Center in June of this year was a major program undertaken by Sister Gladys Marie to expand to service to the community. The center houses under one roof an adult day health care center, a child care center, and a wellness center.

Sister Gladys Marie is responsible for initiating a \$2.3 million cogeneration plant which is expected to save the hospital more than \$12 million in energy cost over the next 10 years and pay for itself in energy savings over the next 3 years.

Last year, through the efforts of Sister Gladys Marie, the hospital opened Fresno's second ambulatory outpatient surgery center, a low-cost alternative for minor elective surgery cases. Within 1 year the program met its 5-year goal.

During her stay at Saint Agnes Medical Center, Sister Gladys Marie has been an innovative and steadfast leader, undaunted in the face of controversy and criticism. Long after she leaves the San Joaquin Valley for her new assignment, the fruits of her labors will be contributing to the health care and well-being of the people she has served. ●

## PUTTING CONGRESS ON HOLD

### HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the October 6 New York Times editorial, which follows, makes a compelling case for holding off on any telephone legislation at this time.

Hastily passed laws could be most detrimental to long-distance rates, local telephone companies, and eventually universal service.

None of us knows fully the ramifications of the AT&T breakup. However, rushing to pass legislation without knowing the implications may bring premature rigidity to a transitional process that needs flexibility.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1983]

#### PUTTING CONGRESS ON HOLD

The Federal Communications Commission wants residential telephone users to pay \$2 a month and businesses as much as \$6 a month for access to long distance. But Congress, fearful of a backlash when the proposed rates start in January, threatens to overrule the decision. That would be an ill-informed mistake.

To the F.C.C.'s critics, the access charges are another assault on common sense by economic theoreticians bent on tinkering with the best telephone system in the world. In fact, flat-fee access charges are no threat to phone service. Far from it. They would produce better service for no more money. Congress seems not to understand that—and should not rush to judge until it does.

A few decades ago, long distance was an expensive luxury in a telephone system built primarily for local use. The way long-distance costs were apportioned was relatively unimportant. But new technology has dramatically changed the economics of telecommunications. Today, the real cost of calling cross-country is only slightly greater than calling crosstown.

Yet for reasons of inertia and politics, the regulators have only recently begun to adjust rates accordingly. Despite this failure to adjust, American phone service remains first-rate. Why should we tinker with it now? In part, because technology forces us to.

Long-distance callers will pay inflated charges only if they have no alternative. Now, heavy users can create their own satellite communications systems, entirely bypassing Ma Bell and her high rates. For the moment, such systems carry only a tiny fraction of long-distance traffic, but the handwriting is on the wall if not in the airwaves: Long-distance charges must come down.

Long-distance callers share the use of billions in equipment in local phone company offices. On average, a quarter of the messages traveling along local wires are long-distance. To compensate the local phone companies, long-distance users are now billed for about a quarter of the local equipment costs, about 15 cents a minute.

What's wrong with that? Once local systems are built, it costs little or nothing to provide access to long distance. The 15-cent-a-minute charge thus needlessly discourages long-distance calls. So Billy calls home from college once a month rather than once a

week. Businesses spend \$4 to type and mail a message that would cost the phone companies only \$3 to handle. Multiply that by millions of long-distance calls not made each day and you get some idea of what the inefficiency costs.

With fixed access rates, individual long-distance calls will cost less, encouraging people to make more of them, thus creating more efficient use of the whole phone system.

Critics charge that to rely more on fixed access fees would force poor people to give up their phones. If that were a realistic danger, more efficient use of long distance might not be worth the social cost. But it's not realistic. In fact, the F.C.C. has invited phone companies to create cheap, no-frills "lifeline" service if they haven't already established it.

Congress has a choice. It can surrender to political panic and vote to retard change, hoping that long-distance callers don't find ways to beat the overcharges. Or it can allow a gradual transition to efficient, cost-based pricing, taking care to protect access to phone service at reasonable prices. And that is no choice at all. ●

## HEALTH CARE COSTS OUT OF CONTROL

### HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, the inflation of health care costs is one of the most important problems facing the Nation. Both public and private spending on health care have grown much faster than the economy, and much faster than anticipated. Total national health care spending has gone from \$51 billion in 1967 to more than \$300 billion in 1982. In the past year alone, health care costs rose 11.9 percent, while general consumer prices rose only 3.9 percent. Spending for health care now accounts for over 10 percent of the gross national product.

Policymakers in the public and private sectors have been grappling with this problem for the last several years with little success.

Although the subject has had great visibility and numerous surveys have shown a high level of public concern, until now no major survey has looked in any detail at the likely reactions of the public, employers, unions, health care providers, and the health insurance industry to the range of options now being debated. The absence of any such survey is significant when one recognizes that no new policy will work unless it is acceptable to the American people. To be effective, such a new policy would require substantial changes in the motives and behavior of both health care users and providers.

To fill that gap, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States commissioned Louis Harris and Associates to conduct a nationwide



survey on this issue. The following groups were surveyed in order to obtain the opinions of a wide range of participants in the health care system:

A national random cross section of 1,501 adults;

A national sample of 100 physician leaders;

A sample of 100 hospital administrators, representing the largest hospitals across the Nation;

A sample of 250 corporate benefits officers from companies in the Fortune lists of the largest industrial and nonindustrial companies; and

A national sample of 26 union leaders who are responsible for health care benefits within major trade unions.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the results of this important survey were released, and for the benefit of my colleagues, I submit for the RECORD a summary of the findings.

The summary follows:

#### SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

1. There is a general consensus that fundamental changes are needed to make the U.S. health care system work better.

The American public, by a three-quarters majority, views the U.S. health care system as needing major changes. This view is shared by large majorities of employers, insurance executives, and unions, and by a marginal majority of hospital administrators. The one exception to this consensus lies with the medical profession: a clear majority of physicians who head medical societies believe that the health care system works pretty well and that only minor changes are needed to improve it.

2. The American public views both the cost of and access to health care services as areas in need of change.

Cost-related and access-related changes head the list of changes in the health care system considered most important by the American public and union leaders. The other professional groups acknowledge the need for cost-related changes, but they also emphasize public education regarding medical programs and costs. The primary change sought by physician leaders is less government interference and regulation.

The public's concern about access centers around care for the elderly. Based on their personal experiences, however, the American people, including the elderly, are largely satisfied with the quality of and access to health care services, and with health insurance benefits.

3. Barriers to medical care.

The 14 percent of the American public who did not obtain needed medical care in the twelve months preceding this survey include sizable numbers of the uninsured (32 percent) and the unemployed (28 percent). The primary barrier to obtaining needed medical care is the cost of this care.

4. There is widespread dissatisfaction with the cost of hospitalization.

While a slight majority of the American public are dissatisfied with the total cost of health care as well as out-of-pocket costs, their criticisms are focused mainly on the cost of hospitalization and cost of laboratory work and X-rays done outside hospitals and clinics. Smaller majorities of the public also consider the cost of doctors' visits and prescription drugs to be unreasonable.

The view that hospital costs are unreasonable is shared by an overwhelming majority

of union leaders, corporate benefits officers, and insurance executives, and by a significant majority of physician leaders. Even among hospital administrators, 40% view hospital costs as unreasonable.

5. There is very little consensus on the main cause of increased spending on health care.

The debate about the main underlying cause of the escalation of health care spending is still unresolved. While slightly more than 40% of the American people view this escalation as due to 'the increasing cost of the same services,' one-third of this group blame 'the use of new and more expensive treatment and equipment.' Physician leaders and hospital administrators view the latter reason as the primary cause of escalating expenditures.

'People using more services than they used to' is not acknowledged as a major cause of escalating expenditures by the American public. However, about 30% of physician leaders and hospital administrators recognize it as a primary cause of this escalation.

The views of corporate benefits officers and union leaders tend to parallel those of the public.

6. The health care system as it is today does little to encourage price competition.

Only 16% of the American public have selected a doctor because of lower fees. Comparison shopping for prescription drugs is viewed as easier than shopping for health insurance, doctors, or hospitals. Shopping for laboratory tests and X-rays is viewed as difficult by a sizable majority of the American public.

11. Most corporate executives whose companies have implemented new cost-containment programs believe that the programs are effective.

Corporate executives whose organizations have had experience with various cost-containment measures are more likely to judge them as effective than are those who have had no experience with these measures. This is particularly true for programs that require increased cost-sharing by employees and for those that provide better coverage for lower cost health care options, such as home care for chronically ill and the use of nurse practitioners, midwives, and physicians' assistants.

12. There is widespread opposition to proposed tax on employer-paid premiums.

One policy that is rejected by the majority of respondents in most groups as ineffective and unacceptable as a cost-containment measure is the often-discussed individual tax on a portion of the employer-paid health insurance premiums. The physician leaders are the only group in which a clear majority find this proposal to be both effective and acceptable.

13. Shifting costs from Medicare patients to other patients is viewed with disfavor.

The majority of the American public and majorities of all of the professional groups disapprove of the practice of shifting costs from Medicare patients to other patients. This disapproval is voiced as strongly by those who do receive Medicare benefits as those who do not.

14. There is general support for programs that provide health insurance for the unemployed, but it diminishes sharply when viewed as resulting in greater costs for other people.

The American people (including the unemployed) and corporate benefits officers reveal a marginal reluctance to support health care benefits for the unemployed if

such benefits result in higher direct or indirect costs to other people. However, sizable minorities (of more than 40%) are in favor of these benefits despite their costs.

Physician leaders, insurance executives, and hospital administrators, on the other hand, favor providing these benefits.

15. Overall, the American public reveals awareness of and concern about health care issues.

The majority of the American public are remarkably aware of and concerned about problems related to health care coverage and health care services. This is reflected in the relatively insignificant numbers of respondents who give "not sure" or "no opinion" responses to the questions asked in this survey.

7. The lack of price competition in the system is acknowledged as a reason for the rise in health care spending.

Large majorities of the American public and all of the professional groups except the physician leaders agree that the lack of competitive pricing among doctors, hospitals, or nursing homes contributes to the rise in health care spending.

The opinions of physician leaders contrast sharply with those of all of the other groups, including hospital administrators. While only 37 percent of the physician leaders blame lack of price competition for the increase in health care spending, 68 percent of hospital administrators do so.

On the other hand, there is general consensus that as long as third-party payers assume all or most of the cost of health care, there is no incentive for patients or providers to cut spending or costs.

8. The American people and most professionals recognize that programs and practices that benefit them are also a source of inflation in health care spending.

Majorities in all groups mention the following as contributing to cost escalation: The increased availability of employer-paid health insurance, hospitalization for minor ailments, the growth of malpractice suits, people staying in hospitals longer than is necessary, the aging of the population, increased availability of government funded programs, and overuse of tests by doctors.

Physician leaders, in general, are least willing to recognize the actions of their own profession as contributing to the rise in health care spending, while hospital administrators have a more balanced view. While majorities of respondents in all groups recognize that "one of the problems in health care is that there is no real competition to keep prices down," only 27 percent of the physician leaders agree with this view.

9. The American public is ready to accept a broad range of cost-containment proposals.

The conventional wisdom that the American public will resist major changes in the health care system is called into question by the findings of this study.

The American public is remarkably willing to accept a broad range of cost-containment policies, including those that would increase out-of-pocket costs to the public and minimally curtail freedom of choice among health care options.

This willingness to accept proposed changes is based on the belief that the changes will be effective in slowing health care cost inflation. These findings suggest that the public would be willing to accept such changes because of a sense of realism and an understanding that the changes are necessary, rather than because they support them enthusiastically.

The proposals that the public considers most acceptable are: Alternatives to the use of hospitals for minor surgery, tests, or the treatment of the chronically ill, increased cost-sharing in the payment of health insurance premiums and increased deductibles, diagnosis-related cost caps on hospital and doctors' fees, requiring second opinions on non-emergency surgery, insurance rate incentives for preventive care, prepaid plans and preferred provider plans, and using low-cost alternatives to physicians and hospital care.

10. Professional groups have varying perspectives on the cost-containment proposals. Union leaders, corporate benefits officers, and insurance executives generally share the views of the American public, and they are willing to accept almost all of the proposed changes in the health care system.

Hospital administrators are generally willing to accept changes in the health care system in the interest of cost containment, even if the changes mean a reduction in hospital use or a restriction on the fees charged by hospitals.

Physician leaders are the least willing of all groups surveyed to accept—or even to recognize as effective—changes that are likely to adversely affect the financial incentives for their profession.●

**JOHN SHAUGHNESSY, JR., HONORED FOR 25 YEARS OF RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP**

**HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● **Mr. MORRISON.** Mr. Speaker, telephone workers across the State of Connecticut are, this day, honoring the man who has led them for 25 years as president of the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers, Local 400 of the Telecommunications International Union. John W. Shaughnessy, Jr., has exemplified determined, responsible labor leadership in an industry that requires a far-reaching vision to prepare for the continuing changes in technology which have marked the telecommunications industry.

This has been particularly true in 1983, as Southern New England Telephone Co., the Bell System, and the entire industry are facing the enormous challenge of deregulation and competition. John Shaughnessy foresaw many of the human concerns raised by such widespread change in governmental policy when he authored the "Technology—Promise and Problems," in 1968 for the students who are today's work force.

Yet, his extraordinary energies have been channeled into the day-to-day problems of people as well as to future concerns. No better evidence can be found than his being named the National Kidney Foundation's Volunteer of the Year in 1977. It was typical of John that he began his involvement with the NKF upon hearing that some

of his union members had family members with serious kidney ailments.

Few men understand the workings of our democratic society as well as John Shaughnessy. He has faced and won elections in both the political sphere and in his union over the course of a 32-year career. In that time, he has lost only one election, and that, it is clear today, has been to the benefit of 10,000 telephone workers who might have lost their leader to a full-time position as mayor of East Hartford, after he served in 1968 as the last part-time mayor. From this experience, John Shaughnessy became very much aware that democracy shows itself to be an efficient form of government, and he knows that no other system approaches it as a means of meeting the hopes and aspirations of both citizens and union members.

John also spends enough time in Washington so that he is more than a visitor. As the president of the Telecommunications International Union, he also serves as chairman of the bargaining team which meets with AT&T every 3 years to negotiate new contracts. He stays in frequent touch with our elected representatives and important members of the executive branch on issues as specific as telecommunications policy and labor law and as general as health and human services. Because the CUTW's headquarters is in Hamden and many of his union members work in the New Haven area, he has maintained a special relationship with the Congressman from the third district, a relationship I am proud to maintain.

His Washington service includes membership on the White House Conference on Aging in 1960, the President's Committee on the Department of Labor's 50th anniversary, and the White House Conference on the Industrial World Ahead.

These accomplishments seem pale in comparison to the accumulation of thousands of instances of individual concern and help he has offered to his union members, his fellow residents in East Hartford, and numerous national and State leaders. He has proven that enlightened, responsible labor leadership results in a better life for workers and a strong and just America.●

**TOO MUCH, FOR TOO MANY**

**HON. ELTON RUDD**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● **Mr. RUDD.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial written by the Reverend John Doran, a Catholic priest now living in retirement on the west coast, who I believe has a pretty good handle on what is going on here in Washington D.C.

Father Doran, writing in the *Alive* magazine, the official publication of the Roman Catholic diocese of Phoenix, Ariz. points out that the liberals of the last few decades made a huge mistake from which this country still is suffering.

That mistake, he says, was the effort by the liberals to do too much for too many.

Father Doran says the huge Federal deficits that we see year after year are due, at least in part, to this mistake.

His comments are right on target and they should be read by every Member of this body.

I urge my colleagues to not only read the article, but also to learn from it.

The article follows:

**FEDERAL DEFICIT GROWS IN PART FROM DOING TOO MUCH FOR TOO MANY**

(By Father John Doran)

The liberals of the last few decades made one huge mistake from which the country is still suffering, and will continue to suffer.

This mistake is nearly as responsible for the terrible deficits our national budget includes as is our defense spending. It is the cause of the locked in, but ever-growing mandated spending. It is caused by laws enacted to meet certain of people's expenses, but laws enacted on woefully underestimated projections.

The basic cause of the mistake was the desire to help people in their needs. This is a laudable enough desire, but the way of trying to meet those needs was wrong. Instead of trying to help out people who had needs, they tried to help out everyone. The government set out, not to provide cots for those who have no place to sleep, but to make a bed for everyone.

This is, interestingly enough, a mistake which our church never made. The church has gone into many charitable activities, but always on the basis of helping those who needed help, not trying to help everyone.

Medicare is a good example of doing too much for too many. It is, of course, necessary to help give medical care to those who cannot afford it. But Medicare did not set out to do this. Medicare set out to provide medical costs to huge classes of people whether they needed the help or not. Millionaires can have their medical bills paid just as easily as can the poorest persons, probably more easily.

What happened? Medical costs skyrocketed. Doctors found an easy source of income from a law which they originally opposed. Hospitals found a source of revenue so great that health care is now a lucrative business. No facet of the economy has inflated as much as the cost of health care. And, ironically, Medicare which spread itself so thin trying to take in those who wanted it, not just those who needed it, is now finding itself required to reduce its share of costs. It will reach the point before long that people will be paying as much for medical care over and above Medicare's payments as they were paying before Medicare came into being.

Social Security began with the idea of being an insurance, and as such should pay back to all who paid into it. Successive liberal legislatures have, however, kept upping the payments to people until they have come preciously close to bankrupting the



whole system. Congress gave up the insurance idea and made Social Security another government benevolence.

The sad part of all this is that our government has taught us to take less and less responsibility upon ourselves. We look to the government to provide for a part of our future and even for our parents' present. Responsibilities which should be ours we now expect the government to shoulder. We have become so spendthrift we hardly realize that our government has become the same.

The government can pay out only what it takes in or borrows. Liberals seem to think that the government's borrowing power is unlimited and thus its spending can be unlimited too. It's a dream which has so long been in vogue that no one wants to think of a rude awakening. ●

#### PROTECTION AT ANY PRICE?

**HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 1983*

● **Mr. DANNEMEYER.** Mr. Speaker, the question at hand—protection at any price—will soon come before the House if the Rules Committee forwards H.R. 1234, the domestic content bill, to the floor.

An article in the July/August issue of *Regulation* magazine, published by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, speaks directly to this question.

Protectionist policies . . . are intended to help certain industries and save certain jobs—and indeed, they may succeed, though only in the short run. But, we should ask, at what cost and to whom? The costs take two forms: protected domestic products become more expensive, and restricted imported products become both more expensive and less available.

The article goes on to make a very important point.

The largest single group that bears the cost of protectionism—domestic consumers—is probably the group least aware of the costs. After all, those costs are often widely dispersed and hard to identify. Who could track down the ramifications of higher prices of bolts, cement, specialty steel, or even apparel?

The authors are well qualified to speak to this issue. Murray L. Weidenbaum is former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and currently director of the Center for the Study of American Business at Washington University in St. Louis. He is joined by Michael C. Munger, a research analyst at the center.

Their research focused on quantifying the costs of protectionism. They found that measuring the costs is difficult and only included those for which sound data is available. Thus, their figures are very conservative estimates. The bottomline of their research is that protectionist trade barriers cost consumers at least \$58.5 billion in 1980. This works out to a tax of \$255 per person, or fully \$1,020 for a

family of four. The authors believe that an inflation adjusted figure for 1983 would be at least \$71 billion.

The other key figure to note from their article is that the cost per each job protected by the domestic content bill would be \$85,400—1980 dollars—or 3.6 times the average compensation for an auto job. They cite a staff study of the Council of Economic Advisers for this data.

The consumer will be the victim if Congress passes a domestic content bill or other unwarranted protectionist legislation. I urge my colleagues to review the article before H.R. 1234 comes to the floor. To facilitate this process, I insert the full text of the article at the conclusion of my remarks:

#### PROTECTION AT ANY PRICE?

(By Murray Weidenbaum and Michael Munger)

While many types of federal regulation have been reduced somewhat in recent years, one type has grown in both scope and intensity—restrictions on trade with other nations. Of course, protectionist barriers usually increase in severity during periods of high domestic unemployment, and there is no reason why the recent downturn in economic activity should have been any different. The problem is that the protectionist trend is continuing unabated during the current economic upturn.

In 1981-82, the United States imposed or negotiated higher trade barriers on a wide array of products, including bolts, screws, and heavy industrial fasteners, cement and other road construction materials, numerous carbon and specialty steel products, Japanese light trucks and motorcycles, and textiles and apparel from mainland China. More recently, explicit export subsidies, long eschewed by the United States, were put in place this spring and summer on U.S. wheat, milk, and cheese shipped to Egypt—as a means of retaliating against similar European practices. In June, following a recommendation from the International Trade Commission, President Reagan raised new barriers against a number of foreign specialty steel products such as hardened alloy tool and some types of stainless steel. Meanwhile, Congress continues to entertain the domestic content bill (S. 707 and H.R. 1234), which would require high-volume automakers, after a phase-in period, to produce domestically at least 70 percent of the value of the cars they sell in this country. This requirement would present great obstacles to Japanese auto producers.

#### WHO BEARS THE COSTS?

Protectionist policies consist of tariffs, quantity limitations (quotas or bilaterally negotiated agreements), and a variety of other regulatory barriers such as "Buy American" laws, discriminatory quality standards, and the trigger price mechanism. These policies are intended to help certain industries and save certain jobs—and, indeed, they may succeed, though only in the short run. But, we should ask, at what cost and to whom? The costs take two forms: protected domestic products become more expensive, and restricted imported products become both more expensive and less available. The largest single group that bears the cost of protectionism—domestic consumers—is probably the group least aware of the costs. After all, those costs are often widely dispersed and hard to identify.

Who could track down the ramifications of higher prices of bolts, cement, specialty steel, or even apparel?

Consumers are not only the group bearing the costs of U.S. trade policy. Among the other victims are U.S. producers of unprotected goods, especially producers of goods exported to other nations. They are hurt directly when foreign countries retaliate against U.S. trade barriers, and indirectly when our trade barriers succeed in limiting foreign imports and thereby make it harder for foreigners to obtain the dollars they need to buy U.S. products. Indeed, once the balance of trade readjusts, exports fall by as much as imports. Similarly, some domestic producers are hurt because they have to pay higher prices for protected inputs. Thus, for example, domestic automakers that use protected steel have trouble competing with foreign automakers that can buy lower-priced steel on the world market. This leads U.S. automakers, like other producers in similar situations, to request protection.

While the costs that protectionism imposes on producers are probably not a trivial component of the total, only the costs borne by U.S. consumers are examined here. The burden that tariffs impose on consumers can be divided into three parts: (1) the tariff revenue itself, which is an explicit tax that transfers funds from consumers who buy the imported product to the government, (2) an implicit tax or transfer of funds from consumers to producers, reflecting the increased prices of protected domestic products, and (3) dead-weight static losses, caused by the misallocation of resources that trade barriers encourage. Quantity restrictions and other regulatory barriers raise no revenue for the government, but do impose both the second and the third of the above costs.

That trade barriers are, in effect, a tax can be seen by realizing that the government could choose to support a faltering domestic industry either by protecting its market from foreign competition or by taxing consumers and subsidizing the industry with the proceeds. In the case of all three forms of protectionism, the transfer to the protected industry is directly from the consumer, rather than from the consumer via government.

#### MEASURING THE COSTS

The technique we used to estimate the total "hidden tax" borne by consumers was to assemble from the existing literature cost estimates for specific programs, and then to make additional estimates of our own for some tariffs where the required data were available. Our literature search turned up twenty-one studies giving figures for various tariffs, quotas, orderly marketing agreements, and the trigger price mechanism. Our tariff estimates were derived by taking the average U.S. tariff rates after the Tokyo Round of multilaterally negotiated reductions (as estimated by Alan V. Deardorff and Robert M. Stern, *Southern Economic Journal*, January 1983), and multiplying them by total domestic consumption. All estimates were adjusted as necessary to 1980 prices.

The results appear in Table 1—a total of \$58.5 billion in costs imposed on consumers in 1980. Two aspects of this estimate should be emphasized.

First, the figure substantially understates what the consumer actually pays for protectionism because the underlying estimates are incomplete. Part of the reason for this is

that they reflect the static, or short-run, costs, but not the dynamic costs. And, as Ilse Mintz explained in her pioneering study for the American Enterprise Institute, Dynamic costs may, in the long run, far exceed static ones. But they can be measured only on the basis of intensive and detailed studies of each of the industries affected. . . . Such studies are not available, and all one can do is to keep in mind that the static costs . . . are only part of the story [U.S. Import Quotas: Costs and Consequences, 1973].

Dynamic costs include losses in capacity, innovation, or productivity that occur when firms are insulated from market forces that give impetus to corrective changes in industry structure and production methods. Trade restraints keep resources in relatively unproductive industries and increase the costs of labor and materials for industries that otherwise would have a higher competitive potential. Any industry that is insulated for a substantial period against the pressure of international markets is likely to find itself far behind its competition, saddled with obsolete methods and equipment.

TABLE 1.—COSTS OF PROTECTIONISM TO U.S. CONSUMERS

(In billions of 1980 dollars)

Product category	Types of Restriction		Total
	Tariffs	Quantity limitations and other barriers	
Textiles and apparel	\$15.0	\$3.4	\$18.4
Machinery and transport equipment	15.9		15.9
Metals and minerals	7.3	2.8	10.1
Other manufactured products	5.5	2.6	8.1
Agricultural	2.1	3.9	6.0
Total	45.8	12.7	58.5

Source: Michael C. Munger, "The Costs of Protectionism."

Our overall estimate is also understated because the static cost estimates are themselves incomplete. They do not include orderly marketing agreements on autos, ball bearings, batteries, dairy products, meat, mushrooms, and tin. Nor do they include building code restrictions on ceramic tile, the fruit juice tariff (averaging 27 percent), "Buy American" limitations on government procurement, and the Jones Act rules on the use of U.S. flag vessels. While the orderly marketing agreement for mushrooms may be a trivial omission, the "voluntary" restrictions on autos, dairy products, and meats create substantial transfers of income. A significant part of this transfer comes about because foreign producers respond to quantity limitations by shifting their exports from cheaper to more expensive goods. Japanese automakers, for example, have stayed within their U.S. quota, while increasing their sales revenues, by exporting to this country larger numbers of higher-priced cars loaded with more accessories. The results is that low-income customers find fewer products available in their price range.

The second point to stress about our overall estimate is that, even though it is incomplete, it represents a significant and little-recognized burden to the consumer. Trade barrier costs of \$58.5 billion in 1980 amounted to an implicit per-capita tax of \$255 that year—or \$1,020 for the average family of four—to protect a variety of domestic industries. If we adjust for inflation but make no allowance for the many protectionist programs that have been added since 1980, the total cost for 1983 is \$71 billion.

Turning to some details of our figures, the total tax or transfer associated with tariffs is about \$45.8 billion, with another \$12.7 billion resulting from quantity limitations and other regulatory barriers. In the product category totals, the largest cost is for textile and apparel restrictions—\$18.4 billion, of which only \$3.4 billion is derived from quantity limitations. Given that the textile and apparel trade is heavily affected by such quantitative pacts as the Multifiber Arrangement, the figure for these costs would probably be many times larger if they were not so difficult to estimate.

The second largest cost is for machinery and transportation equipment restrictions—at \$15.9 billion. This figure does not include any costs at all for quantity restrictions on autos (the most significant omission) and other items, again because of gaps in the existing literature. The metals and minerals category of \$10.2 billion includes restrictions on aluminum, copper, iron, steel, zinc, and various other metals and minerals. Fourth, restrictions on miscellaneous manufactured goods include footwear, furniture, stainless steel flatware, glass products, printing and publishing, and myriad other products. Finally, for agricultural products, quantity restrictions contribute more to the cost burden than tariffs: \$3.9 billion of the agriculture total of \$6 billion comes from quotas and orderly marketing agreements.

## THE LONG-RUN COSTS OF "SAVING" JOBS

In light of these large costs, it is difficult to understand the popularity of trade barriers as national policy—except in light of the politics of protectionism. All of the protectionist devices are means by which small, well-organized groups use the political process to their advantage. That the tax effects of these devices are hidden is of no small importance in explaining their attractiveness to policy makers and to business. Certainly, direct subsidization of producers leading to increased taxes—or, more likely, to increased deficits—would be very unpopular politically. Protectionist aid to industries facing strong foreign competition, on the other hand, can be rationalized by pointing the finger at foreigners. In addition, such aid does not threaten company managements with the direct government intervention that explicit subsidies would involve.

The ability of protectionist barriers to save jobs is limited and can never be viewed as more than a temporary measure. But the cost is difficult to justify even in the short run. Table 2 gives estimates of the total cost per job "saved" by five protectionist programs. The ratio of the consumer costs for those programs to the compensation paid to workers ranges from 3.5 for carbon steel to 9.3 for restrictions on footwear imports. Put simply, current protectionist policies "save" jobs at a cost to consumers that is many times what a job is worth to the worker being protected. The difference between the compensation paid and the total implicit transfer from consumers goes partly to the owners of the protected firms and partly to sheer waste (because resources are used to produce goods domestically that could be produced more cheaply elsewhere).

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED ANNUAL COSTS TO CONSUMERS PER JOB PROTECTED

(In 1980 dollars)

Product	Average compensation	Consumer cost per job protected	Ratio of cost to compensation
Television receivers (tariffs and quotas)	\$12,923	\$74,155	5.7
Footwear (tariffs and quotas)	8,340	77,714	9.3
Carbon steel (tariffs and quotas)	24,329	85,272	3.5
Steel (trigger price mechanism)	24,329	110,000	4.5
Autos (proposed "domestic content" bill)	23,566	85,400	3.6

Sources: Compensation figures are from Department of Labor, "Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey: A Databook," vol. 1 (September 1982), adjusted to include fringe benefits. Estimates of the consumer cost per job created in television, footwear, and carbon steel are derived from Robert Crandall, in Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1978; the estimate for steel comes Crandall, in Regulation, July/August 1980, and that for autos from a Council of Economic Advisers staff study.

Moreover, even these very expensive benefits to workers may be short-lived. There is, as already noted, a tendency for trade barriers to proliferate, as firms that sell products in open markets but buy materials in protected markets find they too need some form of protection. There is also the possibility of foreign retaliation. Our trading partners may succumb more readily to domestic political pressures to raise trade barriers if we have increased ours. The devastating beggar-thy-neighbor policies many nations practiced following U.S. passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff in 1930 should serve as a vivid reminder of the global repercussions of protectionism.

Moreover, in addition to the direct consumer costs estimated here, trade barriers impose high long-run costs on the protected industry itself. Even the benefits of trade barriers to the protected industry are not unambiguous, because an industry that once sought protection as a short-run cure often ends up dependent on it for survival. Finally, and most important of all, trade barriers damage our economy's competitive strength. As William Brock, U.S. trade representative, has said: "Nations which protect their economies today will pay the costs of a decline in competitiveness tomorrow."

In the current environment, international trade policy will not sit still. Our choice today is between further drift to global protectionism or a joint effort by the United States and its trading partners to remove the obstacles already threatening open world markets. The longer we wait, the more numerous the barriers and the more difficult the task of removing them.●

## THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF EASTSIDE BAPTIST CHURCH, BALTIMORE, MD.

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor on Wednesday, October 5, 1983, to participate in the 25th anniversary of the Eastside Baptist Church of Baltimore, Md. It was an occasion for good fellowship. The church is pastored by Rev. C. C. Alexander. The following is what his congregation has to say about this fine minister.



Rev. C. C. Alexander was born in Lawrenceville, Va. He was brought up in a good old, old-fashioned Christian atmosphere, and moved to Baltimore at an early age, where he became a member of First Baptist Church. He was educated in Baltimore Public Schools and later went on to Morgan, then a college, and to Lynchburg Seminary.

Reverend Alexander is blessed with a lovely wife, Mrs. Carolyn Alexander, and three precious children, one of whom is now in the clergy.

Since founding the Eastside Baptist Church, "The Church With the Friendly Feeling," some 25 years ago, Reverend Alexander has spent several years as president of the United Baptist Missionary of Maryland. Among other things he has played an intricate part in the building of the Baptist Aged Home, which has proven to be a great success and a godsend to the people that it serves.

We, the members of Eastside Baptist Church wish to make some expression of our gratitude for this occasion and our pleasure in being here. This is by all odds one of our most significant affairs, for we have come together in recognition of our beloved pastor and in celebration of his 25th anniversary with Eastside Baptist Church.

We wish to pay respect to his courage, symbols of wisdom, and understanding of our shortcomings, his consoling council, and the fatherly way in which he has tried to lend a helping hand. These things have endeared him to us in no uncertain terms.

We have not only received spiritual food from his ministry but we have been blessed with his leadership in Christian fellowship that has given us a more serviceable way of life.

We are grateful for him because he stands as tall as the timber in the midst of the rich swamplands of our generations. He represents the kind of person that he speaks of in his messages; those who work because they love the one they are following, and those who are sold to the idea of brotherhood. We respect his leadership because his life is in keeping with his teachings. We have no trouble following the light which he so firmly holds up for us to see.

The spirit of his congregation stems from his big heart, for he truly shares not only his God-given talents but also material things that his lambs and sheep may be fed. The glory of his stewardship is felt not only in the church, but the entire community feels its presence. We feel proud of him because even though he stands high in leadership, he is always close enough to each of us that we may reap some benefit from his presence.

Whatever efforts we have made on his behalf are quite small compared with the efforts he has made and the success he has attained on our behalf;

so we can only wish with all our hearts God's blessings heaped upon him as the years roll by and may all his sorrows roll away.

The life of Mrs. Carolyn Alexander has been so full and fruitful that we must pay tribute to her and express our appreciation for her influence on the man whom we honor here tonight. She has kept the home fires burning while simultaneously maintaining a faithful and productive membership in our church. ●

#### IN MEMORY OF C. BLAND GUTHRIE

#### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 1983*

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Congressman DAN COATS and I join in paying tribute to Lt. Col. C. Bland Guthrie who died of cancer on October 8.

Bland Guthrie served in the U.S. Army from June 1967 to May 1983. It was during his last tour of duty as Legislative Liaison for the U.S. Army, U.S. House of Representatives that we had the privilege of working with him and it was during this time that we became friends.

Bland Guthrie was a dedicated, hard-working Army officer who knew how to get things done. He had the ability to make everyone he came in contact with feel important and sense the urgency of the mission at hand. It did not matter if you were a Congressman who needed guidance with logistics or a clerk typist who needed help in following through on correspondence, we all became part of an important mission as we worked together in carrying out our day-to-day obligations. This is just one of Bland's special abilities which helped to bring out the best in people he came in contact with. We will miss him.

Bland Guthrie was a man devoted to his country and he compiled a record of excellence and accomplishment. His outstanding record of service to our country is an example that merits our attention. Among the awards and decorations he received for his faithful service to our country are: Silver Star, Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal, and Army Commendation.

I know all our colleagues join in expressing sympathy to Bland Guthrie's wife, Anita, and the rest of his family. They can be proud of the life he lived, of the service he provided his country, and the example he left to those who knew him.

DAN COATS and I would like to share with our colleagues a letter from one of Bland's friends, Lt. Col. Bill Richards, currently serving in Belgium. This letter was read at services held in

the Old Chapel at Fort Meyer and touched us deeply. I submit it to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

We gather to honor and remember Carroll Bland Guthrie. In a life of service cut short, Bland was an inspiring leader and respected colleague. His most conspicuous legacy is the example he set, through his distinctive blend of intellect, determination, candor, courage and individualism. Bland gained the respect and affection not only of the soldiers and officers of this nation, but also of comrades in several allied nations as well. Wherever he served, his influence and concern was deep and wide.

Throughout his years of service, Bland was always open to new ideas and inspired his fellow professionals to new challenges. His enthusiasm was contagious. He appreciated the past, but saw no reason to be shackled by it. It is both ironic and tragic that someone with so high an interest in the future, someone who contributed so much to the betterment of the future, should be denied its wonders.

It is the memory of Bland's personal relations with each of us that make us feel his loss most painfully. His friendship enriched our lives. His death diminishes us and leaves a chasm we cannot close. There was no limit to what Bland would do for the many of us he called friend. With characteristic selflessness he made us feel better about ourselves and about life.

Bland gave us so much. Most of us who became his friend received the added blessing of meeting, through Bland, others for whom we developed deep affection. Bland also brought Anita into our lives; and through their daughter Anne, we can treasure his memory.

Life indeed must go on, but for us it must be with a void we cannot fill. Just as Bland's part in our lives brought such brightness and joy, so must his passing be endured with such sorrow. We cannot forget him; we will not forget him. We will be ever the richer for knowing and loving him. ●

#### A TRIBUTE TO ALLAN ZIEGLER

#### HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 1982*

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Allan Ziegler, a prominent Los Angeles leader who will receive the prestigious Heart of Gold award of October 29, 1983.

This unique award is presented annually by the Medallion Group of Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in recognition of an individual who has made outstanding contributions to philanthropic causes.

Mr. Ziegler moved to Los Angeles in 1922. After his graduation from Los Angeles High School, he continued his education at the University of Southern California where he received both his bachelor's and law degree. While attending college, Mr. Ziegler became active in founding Westco Products, a family business, which is now the lead-

ing manufacturer of bakery supplies in the United States.

During World War II, he served his country with distinction as a lieutenant on the destroyer, U.S.S. *Laymon*.

Twenty five years ago, Mr. Ziegler received the first Eternal Light Award from the Jewish Theological Seminary for his humanitarian efforts. Over the years, he and his wife, Ruth, have continued these efforts directing them toward several worthwhile charities and institutions. Among their major contributions have been the endowment of the administration building at the University of Judaism and facilities at Sinai Temple, Camp Ramah and the Jewish Home for the Aging.

Mr. Ziegler's leadership positions have included the presidency of Sinai Temple, including the honorary life president, member of the executive board of the University of Judaism, executive member of the National Ramah Commission, vice president of Camp Ramah and Los Angeles Hebrew High School and member of the board of homes for the aging. In addition, Mr. Ziegler has served as an officer of the National Bakery Suppliers Association for years.

It is a pleasure to bring Mr. Ziegler's accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues and to commend Mr. Ziegler for his exemplary display of public service. He is an exceptional member of our community and most deserving of the Golden Hand Award. ●

#### H.R. 1028—COMPUTER CHIP COPYRIGHT

**HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I recently became a cosponsor of H.R. 1028, the Semiconductor Chip Protection Act of 1983. This bill provides needed protection against chip piracy for U.S. manufacturers of semiconductor chip products.

The semiconductor industry is a vital and rapidly growing part of the U.S. economy. The Bureau of Industrial Economics of the Department of Commerce forecasts that in 1983 the industry will ship more than \$12.2 billion worth of semiconductor and related devices, a substantial increase from the \$10.5 billion 1982 value of shipments. It is projected that in 10 years the semiconductor market will have sales of more than \$90 billion, thus becoming one of the world's most important product markets and the basis for computers and telecommunications, two out of the four major industries of the 1990's.

As the level of complexity of semiconductor circuits has grown, so has

the cost of creating new chip designs to embody those circuits economically and efficiently. In recent testimony during hearings on August 3 before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice, an industry spokesman noted that the research and development costs for a single complex chip now can cost approximately \$5 million, while related support and development costs for that chip could amount to another \$50 million or more. These increasing cost factors have both made the return from piracy to would-be chip pirates and made the cost of their piracy greater to legitimate chip manufacturers. The net effect of chip copying is to sharply curtail the normal recovery period during which an innovative chip manufacturer can recoup the research and development costs that the manufacturer invests in creating a new chip and putting it on the market. Unless investments in chip creation can be recovered, fewer and fewer companies will make the research and development investment necessary for advancing chip technology. Instead, more and more companies will engage in chip copying to the detriment of the worldwide technological competitive edge of the United States.

There are no effective legal means at this time to stop chip piracy. Protection for chip layouts under the patent laws is not available, as a practical matter, despite the fact that creativity in devising these layouts is a critical factor in reducing manufacturing costs. Protection under existing copyright law is also not available for chip designs, because the layouts of chips are utilitarian in nature. Under existing copyright law, utilitarian objects cannot effectively be protected, even though their creation may involve great creativity and be of considerable economic value.

Legislation has been introduced in both Houses that goes a long way toward eliminating chip piracy by providing copyright protection. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks of the Senate Judiciary Committee has introduced S. 1201, and my distinguished colleagues from California, Messrs. EDWARDS and MINETA, have introduced H.R. 1028. This legislation provides a 10-year term of protection for the layout of chips and at the same time protects innocent good-faith purchasers of these products. It recognizes a new kind of copyrightable work, "mask works," and provides protection specifically devised for such works.

It is of great importance that this Congress promptly enact legislation protecting semiconductor chip designs. Such legislation, should have the following characteristics:

First, it should accord prompt, inexpensive protection to original semicon-

ductor designs, through a registration system similar to that now in effect for books, pictorial works, and motion pictures. It is essential to have a system that permits rapid securing of protection, without an expensive examination procedure or other high front-end costs. This can best be accomplished by amending the existing Federal copyright laws to cover chip layouts. H.R. 1028, which amends the existing copyright laws for this purpose, is the most efficient and expeditious legislation for creating such protection.

Second, the protection should grant the owner of the chip design the exclusive right to commercially copy and distribute the new chip. H.R. 1028 has such a provision.

Third, the protection should have a relatively short term, such as 10 years. H.R. 1028 provides such a term.

Fourth, there should be an express right of "reverse engineering" chips for the purpose of teaching, analyzing, and evaluating the chip. This is recognized in the industry as a legitimate practice and should be safeguarded. However, reverse engineering should be appropriately defined so that a claim of reverse engineering will not become a pretense for piracy. At this time, H.R. 1028 does not directly address the question of reverse engineering.

Fifth, provision should be made to safeguard the interests of innocent infringers and the public. For example, it is inappropriate to allow injunctions or drastic forms of relief against innocent infringers of chip copyrights. H.R. 1028 expressly provides against that.

Proposed amendments to this legislation have been circulated in the other body, and have been commented on favorably by several witnesses at an August 3 hearing before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice. These amendments would specifically guarantee the right of reverse engineering for teaching, analyzing, and evaluating chips; make the legislation wholly prospective in operation, while at the same time creating "grandfather rights" for persons marketing chips before January 1, 1980; insulate rights under existing copyright law for other works from any diminution or alteration; and limit the exclusive right of the owner of a copyright relating to chips to the manufacture and distribution, but not the use, of the protected chips. These proposed changes would bring H.R. 1028 into accord with the matters that I discussed above, and I fully support H.R. 1028 with these proposed amendments. However, I want to emphasize that I am not wedded to any particular form of language and remain open to suggestions for further improve-



ments in this needed legislation from industry and other concerned parties.

I note further that this legislation would create no new Federal bureaucracy and would cause no revenue loss to the Government. The legislation is commendably narrow in focus, and is restricted to a specific kind of new high technology. It therefore does not raise general and possibly controversial questions that legislation of broader scope could raise. The narrow focus of the legislation avoids opening the bill up to the addition of possibly controversial amendments as to other kinds of commercial or industrial works.

I support this legislation as a salutary step in expanding the two century-old Federal copyright system to bring it more into accord with modern technology and the current needs of the business community. I believe that it is essential that our copyright law should grow with the needs of the times. By appropriately tailoring the new rights and remedies that we create to the needs of industry and the public, we can breathe new life into copyright law and intellectual property law as a whole. I believe that H.R. 1028 is a needed step in that direction.●

#### HEROIC ACTIONS OF GARNER AND WOLD

#### HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a recent incident involving two residents of the district I have the honor to represent.

These two gentlemen, Mr. Brune Garner and Mr. Bruce Wold, are employed by a firm that transports prisoners by air. Mr. Garner is employed as a pilot and Mr. Wold as a guard. During a recent flight a prisoner slipped free of his restraints, drew a pocketknife, and attempted to have Mr. Garner fly to a different location.

Despite a knife wound to the throat, Mr. Garner executed maneuvers with the aircraft which enabled Mr. Wold and the other prisoners to subdue the prisoner. During the scuffle, Mr. Wold was also injured.

Mr. Speaker, the heroic actions of Mr. Garner and Mr. Wold undoubtedly resulted in saving their lives and the lives of their prisoners, and I should like to express my congratulations to them for their quick thinking.●

#### REV. TED K. SMITH, LA PALMA'S OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF THE YEAR 1983

#### HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1983, the La Palma Kiwanis and Women's Club will recognize their "Outstanding Citizen of the Year." I would like to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in honoring this year's winner.

This year's honoree, the Reverend Dr. Ted K. Smith, is the pastor of the United Methodist Church in La Palma. He has served in that capacity since July 1979, after 15 years of service in Hawaii. In only 4 short years, Ted has become an integral part of the La Palma community.

Ted was born on December 15, 1931, in Bellflower, Ill., where he attended elementary and high school. After briefly attending Illinois State College, Ted completed his bachelor of science degree in education at the University of Arizona. Ted received his master of theology degree and doctor of ministry from the School of Theology at Claremont, Calif. Ted served with distinction as a hospital corpsman in the U.S. Navy during the Korean war.

In addition to Ted's many duties as the pastor of the La Palma United Methodist Church, he is active in the La Palma community. Ted is the spiritual aims leader of the La Palma Kiwanis Club. He has established a very active hospital chaplaincy program at the La Palma Inter-Community Hospital. He is an active member of the Buena Park Ministerial Association, and also finds time to visit the elderly in local nursing homes. To those who are without family and friends, Ted's visits are of particular spiritual importance. He is the beacon of light in what is often an otherwise dreary day.

Ted has also not neglected the spiritual needs of young people. He has been the baccalaureate speaker for both Cypress and Kennedy High Schools. He distributes Bibles to Kennedy graduates every year. On Memorial Day, Ted is an active participant in the Women's Club services.

It is not so much for Ted's "official" community activities that he was selected this year but for his private activities. Ted is always available to answer the spiritual needs of anyone—regardless of their church affiliation. It is for his loving touch, his caring ear, and his concerned heart that Ted was selected. He is a humanitarian. His service knows no geographical or denominational bounds—it is done with great compassion and selflessness.

Ted's busy schedule and many works could only be possible with the support of his loving wife, Betty Jean, and their sons, Kenneth and Phil. To each of them, we owe our thanks for sharing Ted with us.

Mr. Speaker, La Palma is a better place because Ted Smith has enriched our lives. I join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to Dr. Ted K. Smith, La Palma's "Outstanding Citizen of the Year."●

JOHN JOHNSON

#### HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, this month, John Johnson will complete his term as president of the National Association of Retail Druggists. It is an appropriate time to recognize his lifelong record of achievement—a record which we in Nebraska have long been familiar with and proud of.

A 1948 graduate of Creighton University School of Pharmacy, Mr. Johnson has received numerous professional honors including the NARD-Merck Service to Society Award, the Harland Lewis Memorial Award, the Creighton University Alumni Award, and the Bowl of Hygieia.

Having served as president of the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Bellevue City Council, he has been a prominent figure in the business development of Bellevue, Nebr., for over 30 years. Mr. Johnson was instrumental in chartering a bank badly needed by local businesses and in raising funds to build Midlands Community Hospital where he has dedicated many hours of service on its board of directors.

Subsequent to his service as regional delegate to the White House Conference on Small Business, he was named the Small Business Administration's 1980 Family Owned Business Advocate of the Year. That family owned business includes his wife Marjorie Johnson and their sons—John Jr., Kevin, and Gale—an impressive team who literally "mind the store" during John's countrywide travel.

As a member of the Small Business and Aging Committees, I have been fortunate to have John Johnson's seasoned insights on issues that fall within the jurisdiction of both committees. John is a special friend who has served his profession well, his community well, and his Nation well. He is the kind of concerned and active citizen that makes this country great, and I am privileged to take this opportunity to commend John Johnson's outstanding accomplishments.●

## HEROISM IN BROOKLYN

## HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, something happened just prior to the summer congressional recess which I wanted to share with my colleagues, because it represents the very best of the human spirit and what we aspire to engender in all members of our society.

On July 15 of this year, Constantine Plits smelled smoke coming from the apartment of his elderly neighbor Sylvia Fagen. He broke down the door of her apartment as she lay unconscious, overcome by smoke. As fire consumed and smoke filled her apartment, Mr. Plits, at enormous risk to his own life, saved Sylvia Fagen. After carrying her from the inferno, he then administered aid to his 70-year-old neighbor until an ambulance had arrived. What is all the more remarkable is that Mr. Plits, a 50-year-old Russian immigrant, has only one arm.

Mrs. Fagen luckily survived what could have been a tragic accident. I'm sad to report, however, that a little over a month ago she passed away in spite of the heroic deed of her neighbor.

That Mr. Plits is a hero in the truest sense of the word is beyond dispute. He did not know, before he burst into the burning apartment, that he would be able to save his neighbor. More significantly, he could not have been sure that he would be able to emerge from the inferno safely. There were other, less risky, options to be sure. But I suspect that Mr. Plits instead chose to view his options from his neighbors point of view.

I do not profess to be able to explain the source of these altruistic impulses which led to this act of courage. Perhaps in his 3 years since coming to the United States from the Soviet Union Mr. Plits has grown to love his community and country and this inspired his heroism. Perhaps instead, he has always possessed these noble qualities. What I do know, however, is that Mr. Plits is a sparkling example for all other members of our society. ●

## TROUBLE ON THE TRACKS

## HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to take up H.R. 3648, the Amtrak Improvements Act, later this week. I am planning to offer two amendments to this legislation. The first would re-

quire Amtrak to restore the position of firemen on intercity passenger trains operating in the Northeast corridor. The position was eliminated on January 1, 1983. The second amendment would require Amtrak to bargain over the position with representatives of the 250 former Conrail employees whose jobs were affected.

I will be writing to all Members of the House to explain the importance of these two amendments. I want to take this opportunity, however, to bring to the House's attention a number of newspaper articles about the issue that have appeared in my district and which provide substantial background information. I also am inserting into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Journal-Courier (New Haven, Conn.) which calls on the Federal Railroad Administration to take responsibility for the safety issue raised by the Amtrak decision. Finally, I am including in the RECORD two newspaper articles which describe tragic railroad fatalities which occurred in Rhode Island this year.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Advocate  
Mar. 1, 1983]

## TROUBLE ON THE TRACKS

(By Bruce Shapiro)

Amtrak has removed firemen from its train cabs, leaving engineers alone. Does that mean the trains are unsafe?

On the afternoon of February 6, a Rhode Island man was killed in Pawtucket by an Amtrak train on its way to Boston. The train had rounded a curve about a quarter of a mile earlier. The engineer didn't see the man and his three children on the tracks. The conductor, farther back on the train, eventually did. He pulled his whistle and brake cord, but by then precious seconds had passed.

The Amtrak engineer was alone in the cab. Until last month there would also have been a second person in the cab—a second pair of eyes, and a second set of reflexes. But on January 1 Amtrak eliminated the second person—the fireman—on its Northeast Corridor trains as a cost-cutting measure.

There is no way of knowing for certain whether the fireman (who in the age of diesel had been an assistant engineer rather than the familiar stoker from the movies) would have spotted the family in time. Engineers say that a fireman, who would have been sitting to the engineer's left and commanded a different view, could probably have seen around the curve at least a bit sooner.

The February 6 accident was a grim postscript to a conversation I had had just a few days earlier with Thomas Cannon, an official of the United Transportation Union (UTU), which represents brakemen, firemen, conductors, and some engineers. Cannon is himself an engineer with 15 years' experience. "Mark my words," he had said. "Without that second man, at the speeds those trains travel, within a short time we will have some serious accidents on our hands."

Cannon's union has been fighting the elimination of the firemen for months, including a court challenge which lost. Now the dispute is threatening to boil over into a major labor controversy. The UTU charges

that Amtrak's elimination of firemen not only poses a serious threat to public safety, but also undermines basic principles of collective bargaining and affirmative action. It is a dispute, union officials say, with long-term national implications.

The roots of the controversy were laid in 1976, when Amtrak took over the Boston-to-Washington Northeast Corridor from bankrupt private railroads. At the time, Amtrak management did not feel equipped to administer its own train crews. Instead it struck a bargain with Conrail, which ran the local commuter lines. Conrail effectively acted as an agent for Amtrak—training, hiring, and supplying crews for the long distance trains.

By 1981, Conrail's profits were not high enough to support its own commuter trains. Congress passed the new Northeast Rail Services Act (NERSA), which went into effect this year, completely reorganizing passenger service in the region. Conrail dropped its commuter lines, which were taken over by the locally controlled Metro-North. Amtrak had by then developed an adequate bureaucracy to manage its crews directly. The same engineers and crew members who had run Amtrak trains through Conrail were brought over.

But Amtrak wanted a change. The company identified several thousand positions it considered expendable—including the 250 firemen. Conrail's contracts with the UTU and with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers (BLE), which bargains for engineers, were still in effect. But Amtrak announced that it was no longer bound by these agreements—that it was, in effect, a new employer—and held no contractual obligations whatsoever to Conrail workers.

"Any engineer," says Mike Doyle, "will tell you there are plenty of times when the fireman has saved his ass." Doyle has operated Amtrak trains since 1975—for the first two years as a fireman, and since 1978 as a full engineer. He handles runs between Boston and New York. Though he is a member of the BLE and his job is not at stake, he has been a highly vocal supporter of the UTU's drive to reinstate firemen.

"My great fear," he says, "is that I or any other engineer will make a serious mistake, cause a serious accident." He describes the myriad of exhausting details which continually demand an engineer's attention: crossings, stop signals, stations, switches. Track conditions change every day and are posted on a board in the trainyard. Automatic speed controls and safety equipment are sometimes not working. A fireman, Doyle says, was essential to keeping an engineer alert; they would check signals with each other, keep tabs on track conditions, perform brake and equipment tests. "It's like needing a copilot in an airplane," Doyle says.

Doyle adds that many engineers are not always operating in peak form. Sometimes they are tired from long, closely spaced consecutive runs. As with pilots and air-traffic controllers, stress is a serious problem—and is aggravated without a second person in the cab. And there is always the possibility that the engineer will be incapacitated through sudden illness or injury.

The main safety device on Amtrak trains is the "alerter"—an electronic monitor based on electrodes implanted in the engineer's seat. The alerter sounds a horn and eventually puts on the brakes if the engineer stops making normal movement or falls off his seat. But Doyle and other engineers say the alerter is unreliable; a recent



Amtrak memo on safety procedures supports their position.

There is another problem as well, Doyle says. "People complain about late trains. Well, there will be a higher frequency of late trains without the firemen. We used to be able to send the fireman back to make repairs, if something went wrong, and keep the train running. Now any time something happens, we've got to stop the train and fix it ourselves." Doyle pauses. "If the trains were late before . . . without that second man, they might not arrive at all."

As with almost any corporation, getting a serious and informed comment out of Amtrak is difficult. George Daniels, the railroad's chief labor relations official, referred all queries to Amtrak's East Coast public relations director, Dianne Elliot. Says Elliot, "We feel it is very safe to operate those trains with one man . . . The fireman performs no useful function in this day and age."

It is an absolute position. "Amtrak has refused from the beginning to negotiate over the second man," says the UTU's Thomas Cannon. "The railroads have been after the firemen for years, at least since the 1950s. But numerous presidential emergency boards (special panels set up to negotiate rail dispute) and mediation panels have sustained our position." In particular, a 1964 presidential emergency board, which settled the largest dispute in recent memory, ruled that firemen were essential for safe operation of the trains.

Cannon calls Amtrak's decision to void the Conrail contract "an attempt to circumvent collective bargaining." Larry Davis, the UTU's general chairman, agrees. He says a serious constitutional question lies at the heart of the dispute. "Amtrak says prior agreements by Conrail aren't protected by NERSA. But, in reality, Conrail was just an agent for Amtrak. Those people were hired and paid for and trained for Amtrak. Does an employee have any rights in an agency relationship?"

One of the sticking points is Congress's intent in passing NERSA. Amtrak, obviously, believes Congress gave it the right to void the workers' contract without compensation. But there is substantial room for disagreement. The wording of NERSA is vague on this point, but comparison with other sections of the act and with early drafts gives some credence to the UTU's position. Metro-North, for instance, is explicitly required to assume all Conrail commuter-line employees. And the original Senate version of NERSA required the same of Amtrak: that it absorb all the Conrail positions, including both people in the cab.

The issue is complicated further, and made more dangerous to collective bargaining in general, by the quasi-public corporate status of both Conrail and Amtrak. Though chartered by Congress, they are both private corporations. If Amtrak's interpretation of NERSA is correct—if the Act voided Conrail's labor obligations—it will mark the first time Congress has intervened on behalf of a troubled company and nullified its obligations with no compensation for the workers affected. The national implications are catastrophic. It would be as if Congress could bail out Chrysler by unilaterally telling the United Auto Workers to take a hike.

There is one group affected by the elimination of firemen more directly than any other. Larry Davis charges that the action will have a wide-ranging effect on Amtrak's affirmative action program. In recent years, many minority firemen have been hired as

eventual engineer candidates; now they will never have the chance to qualify. Says Davis, "Amtrak took just about every one of the blacks hired under affirmative action out. They're the ones who will pay most severely."

Amtrak's Dianne Elliot denies that affirmative action has been affected. But John Winston, director of public affairs for the Federal Railway Administration, says minority firemen "would definitely be affected" disproportionately by the action.

Where does all this leave Amtrak and the former firemen? And where does it leave the passengers on Amtrak's high-speed trains?

This Tuesday, a special mediation board plans to hold a hearing to determine if it has jurisdiction over the dispute. If there is no mediation, the UTU is prepared to take more drastic steps. Says Larry Davis, "This is a national issue. If they can do it with Conrail, they can do it with the Santa Fe or any other road. If there were no mediation, then I would take job action—shut the SOBs down."

In the meantime, there is still only one person in that cab.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Jan. 31, 1983]

#### AMTRAK RUN CALLED RISKY

NO BACKUP FOR ENGINEERS

(By Abram Katz)

Since the beginning of the year Amtrak has been running high-speed trains between Washington, D.C., and Boston with only one man in the locomotive. Engineers and conductors call the new practice a serious hazard.

Engineers used to be accompanied by firemen before Amtrak assumed control of the northeast corridor from Conrail. The fireman helped the engineer remember special instructions and kept an eye out for other hazards that the busy engineer might miss.

Now, engineers complain, they have no one to help keep them alert—and no one to assume the controls if an engineer should suddenly become ill or incapacitated.

Amtrak officials say the diesel and electric locomotives used on the Washington-to-Boston run are equipped with a variety of safety features. Local engineers concede that the "alerters" and "dead-man pedals" in their cabs often work.

Sometimes they do not, however, according to the engineers. Besides, at 100 to 120 miles an hour, a runaway train could travel miles before the emergency brakes brought it to a halt.

Some of the locomotives used by Amtrak cannot be entered from the rest of the train, the engineers add, meaning the conductor cannot routinely check the engineer and cannot intervene in the event of trouble.

Amtrak corporate spokesman Diane Elliott said the federally subsidized railroad does not believe the new "solo engineer" practice presents a hazard. "We don't feel it's unsafe," she said.

The Federal Railroad Administration has refused to act on the question. "We have no jurisdiction, no federal regulations and no involvement whatsoever with that matter," said FRA Director of Public Affairs John Winston.

Amtrak, the FRA and trainmen say the practice of piloting a passenger train with one engineer resulted from a long dispute between the competing United Transportation Union-Engineers, which represents firemen and some engineers, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Fearing its membership would be usurped by the UTUE, the BLE signed a contract with Amtrak allowing one-man operation, explained one engineer. The UTUE also reached an agreement with Amtrak, but is still in disagreement over use of firemen.

Until the dispute between Amtrak and the UTUE is settled, passenger trains will continue to run between Washington and Boston with one man in the cab.

Engineers and conductors insist that running a train with one man at the controls is dangerous. "It isn't safe at all," said Joseph Morrissey, who's been an engineer for 15 years.

"There should be another person there to stop the train if something happens to me. I've been in the railroad 41 years and I never thought the government would allow this kind of thing," said Morrissey, who must drive trains by himself from New Haven to New York, and New Haven to Boston.

Engineers must keep track of dozens of pieces of information, according to engineer Michael Doyle. If they don't, disaster can result. There are work crews to watch out for, "cut-outs" where a train is emptying passengers across a track, curves, switches, debris on the track, cars, trucks, other trains and commuter trains in some areas.

Before an engineer departs from the station he has to review all the hazards he will encounter, and while the train is moving he must make sure he's keeping to schedule and maintain the numerous switches and relays in the locomotive.

Several engineers said they have avoided mishaps because firemen—some engineers prefer the term "assistant engineer"—brought hazards or signals to their attention that they otherwise might have missed.

Going around curves in some locomotives leaves the engineer blind on one side, Doyle added.

"It's not very safe. God forbid he has a heart attack," said conductor Theodore Mekdeci. It's not a safe deal at all. We don't know back there what's going on. Half the time the intercoms don't work. By the time you found out there's a problem it's too late to do anything."

The problem is compounded for engineers who work "off the spare board"—a pool of engineers who are called to work on the spur of the moment at all hours of the day and night.

One engineer who works off the spare board, who asked not to be identified, said he became so drowsy driving a train between New York and New Haven in the early morning hours that only the alerter allowed him to complete the trip.

He would start to fall asleep and the shrill siren and lights would wake him up, every minute or so, for the entire run, he said.

#### 'SPARE BOARD' ENGINEERS' HOURS ERRATIC

(By Abram Katz)

When the work is there you have to take it, so if you're working as an engineer off the "spare board," you may find yourself at the controls of a 12½-ton locomotive and feeling kind of drowsy.

Engineer Michael Doyle works off the board, which represents a pool of engineers who have no set hours. They are called to work whenever Amtrak needs them.

The erratic schedules that result from the spare board and federal "hours of service" laws make putting two people in locomotives even more important, Doyle says.

When the Amtrak dispatcher calls, Doyle explained, you have to take the job or risk being taken off duty. After operating a train for 12 hours, an engineer is required to rest for eight hours, according to federal regulations.

A typical spare board schedule could leave a very tired engineer in a train by himself. "You could get called at 6 p.m. for a train from New Haven to New York, the Merchants Limited," he said. The engineer would have to report at 6:20 p.m. to prepare for the 6:50 p.m. departure, and arrive at New York at 8:30 p.m.

Then the engineer might be asked to run the 9:45 p.m. train back to New Haven. He would arrive at 11:20 p.m. and be off duty by 11:35 p.m.—for a total of five hours and 15 minutes of work.

Under the rules of service that leaves the engineer with six hours and 45 minutes "left" before he must rest.

He goes home and to bed, but the crew caller wakes him up at 2 a.m. and orders the engineer to run the Night Owl from New Haven to Boston. He reports back to the yard at 4:07 a.m. for the 4:37 a.m. departure. With little rest the engineer, who has been working since the previous evening, and was probably up all day before that, now faces a 100-mph trip to Boston by himself.

An "alerter" can keep him awake. It consists of electrodes connected to the engineer's seat and it cycles every 20 seconds. Unless the engineer moves or touches metal the alerter will first flash bright white lights and then sound a siren.

If the engineer does not respond the alerter automatically applies the brakes.

[From the Journal-Courier (Conn.), Feb. 1, 1983]

It's disturbing that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) either cannot or will not act on a question of safety—the practice of running high-speed Amtrak trains between Washington and Boston with only an engineer in the locomotive. An FRA official has said the agency has no jurisdiction and no involvement in the matter. Why not? This is interstate railroad transportation and Amtrak is a federally subsidized line. Federal authorities required the special inspections of wheels that are delaying trains of the New Haven lines.

In the past, an engineer was accompanied by a so-called fireman in a locomotive. The fireman helped the engineer remember special instructions and kept an eye out for other hazards the engineer might miss. But since Amtrak assumed control of the Northeast Corridor line from Conrail, the engineers lack a helper and there is no one to assume controls if an engineer should fall asleep, become ill or incapacitated.

Granted, say the engineers, their cabs are equipped with a variety of safety features including "alerts" and "dead man pedals." But sometimes these don't work and at high speeds a runaway train could travel miles before being stopped by emergency brakes. And some of the Amtrak locomotives can't be entered from the next car. Furthermore, engineers who work on a contingency basis may be tired when taking on an assignment.

Certainly we don't want to continue any featherbedding of the type that has done so much damage to railroad operations. But if there is a real personnel need to substantially reduce potential danger, that need should be filled. It would seem the federal authorities could take responsibility in this important issue.

[From the Providence, (R.I.) Journal, Feb. 7, 1983]

#### TRAIN KILLS PAWTUCKET MAN; SON INJURED (By Rob Levin and Dan Stets)

**PAWTUCKET.**—A Pawtucket man, collecting discarded aluminum cans on railroad tracks, was killed and his 7-year-old son was seriously injured early yesterday afternoon when they were hit by an Amtrak passenger train.

Robert D. Stephens, 33, of 124 Samuel Ave., was hit by the train as he attempted to push his son, Robert Jr., out of its path, according to authorities. His youngest son, Shawn, 4, managed to get away in time and was uninjured, police said.

Authorities said the train was blowing its whistle and its brakes had been applied just before the two were hit. The accident occurred beneath the Mineral Spring Avenue bridge.

For Stephens, an employee of Carol Cable Co., collecting used cans on weekends with his two sons was a way to spend time with the boys and pocket some extra change. According to neighbors, Stephens was saving money for spring when he planned to return to college and complete a bachelor of arts degree in marketing.

As they had so often before, the three piled into the white Volkswagen Rabbit, dressed for the cold and armed with a large, green trash bag in which they would store the cans. The cans would be sold to a recycling center in Pawtucket.

They parked the car in the lot of House of Chin Chinese Restaurant and climbed down the embankment from Mineral Spring Avenue. They had the bag about half full when John J. Hogan, the engineer for the 12:09 Amtrak out of Providence, began his run for Boston.

By the time the train engine had reached about 50 mph, with either three or four passenger cars in tow, it had reached a bend shortly before the Mineral Spring Avenue bridge.

According to police, Hogan saw two people, a man and a young boy, on the track. The 61-year-old engineer gave a sharp blast on the whistle and immediately reached for the brake. The two people, Stephens and his youngest son, Shawn, began running from the train, down the track.

As the wheels locked and the train slid, a third person suddenly appeared on the tracks. Robert Stephens apparently saw Robbie Jr. and turned around to get him, but the train struck both, dragging the father about 150 feet.

He was pronounced dead at the scene by the state Medical Examiner's Office.

Minutes later, police arrived. Ptlm. Edward Velziz found young Shawn wandering near the scene, took him home and told the boy's mother what had happened.

He then took her to Pawtucket Memorial Hospital, where her injured son was. Shawn was also examined there and released. Robert Jr. was later transferred to St. Joseph Hospital in Providence, where he was listed in critical condition last night.

While a large crowd gathered on the bridge, Stephen's body was placed on the train, because of the steepness of the nearby banks, and taken to the next crossing for removal to the state morgue.

Neighbors described Stephens as a devoted family man, a gentle person who never raised his voice and often took his sons fishing. He belonged to the PTA and the South Attleboro Lions Club and was a youth soccer coach in Pawtucket.

He and his family had lived in the second floor of a three-story house on Samuel Avenue, off Smithfield Avenue, for about three years.

A native of Iowa, he met his wife Lesley while in the Navy and stationed in Newport. They were to celebrate their 10th wedding anniversary next month.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Oct. 3, 1983]

#### MAN RUN OVER BY TRAIN NEAR STATION IN WESTERLY

**WESTERLY.**—A man was killed last night when he was run over by an Amtrak passenger train.

Ptlm. Gary Gervasini said the man was decapitated by the train at about 6:45 p.m. about 150 yards west of the station. He said there were no witnesses.

The victim was carrying no identification. Gervasini said police had identified him, but that they were withholding his name until relatives could be notified.

He said that the victim appeared to be in his 20s and that police do not believe he was a victim of foul play, but rather of an accident or suicide.

Amtrak spokeswoman Diane Elliott said the victim was trespassing on the tracks when Train No. 94, the Colonial, hit him. She said he was on Track 2, the eastbound track, which is the southerly of the two tracks passing through Westerly.

She said the train, which runs from Newport News, Va., to Boston, was not scheduled to stop at Westerly. Its next stop was the Kingston Station in South Kingstown.

The accident temporarily delayed Amtrak service, with two trains, the Patriot and an express, both bound for Boston, held up behind the Colonial while officials investigated the accident, Elliott said.

The Colonial, an engine and eight cars, was running late when it hit the victim. Elliott said it was due at Kingston Station at 6:34 p.m.

The Colonial was released by policy shortly before 9 p.m. and so was delayed for about two hours, Elliott said. She said that the other two trains were delayed about one hour and about one hour and 45 minutes respectively.

It was not clear why the man was on the tracks as the train went through the Westerly station. Gervasini said. Elliott said that the railroad considered the victim a trespasser because "anyone on the tracks is a trespasser."●

#### GLENDALE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

##### HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Glendale Symphony Orchestra is deserving of special recognition and the highest commendations on its 60th season as a major musical contributor to the cultural life of southern California. For six continuous decades, this skilled and caring group has enriched the lives of thousands of people who love fine music beautifully prepared.



The Glendale Symphony Orchestra has grown from a small volunteer civic music group into one of the most respected professional orchestras in the country. The history of the orchestra moves from the first concerts in the auditorium of Glendale College to the elegant Dorothy Chandler Pavilion in the Los Angeles Music Center.

From the earliest days, the symphony orchestra and its support groups have maintained strong youth programs with school concerts and scholarships. The interest in youth and the philosophy of presenting listenable music was then and still is an important part of the Glendale Symphony Orchestra.

The orchestra is unique among symphony orchestras in that it operates in the black and has a most dedicated volunteer board and volunteer office staff, which contributes to its success. It is an outstanding example of what can occur when community-minded citizens, interested in fine music, get together and prove that it is not necessary to have substantial Government aid to operate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the Glendale Symphony Orchestra and the Glendale Symphony Orchestra Association for their diligent and devoted efforts to provide the utmost in symphonic arts, and for giving us a constant and beautiful example of what humans can achieve with hard work and high aims. I am proud of this excellent group as are thousands of others. I am confident that its future will be successful and wonderfully melodic.●

#### INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION

### HON. LYNN MARTIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to encourage investment in education. My legislation would allow families to establish a tax-deferred savings account for their child's post-secondary educational expenses.

Quite simply, my legislation applies the successful concept of individual retirement accounts (IRA's) to education. It is appropriate, I believe, to expand upon a concept that has produced marked results. IRA's have proven that people will save if given an incentive.

Knowing that the cost of schooling at a 4-year public institution will increase over 140 percent during the next 18 years, families today need help in planning for their child's education. My legislation provides that assistance by allowing an annual contribution of up to \$1,200 to a tax-deferred savings account.

My legislation, moreover, takes into consideration that a student may not attend a post-secondary institution immediately after graduation from high school. Under my bill, a student has until his or her 27th birthday to use any or all of the funds for higher educational purposes. Once the student reaches 27, however, one-tenth of the total savings used would be added to his or her gross income over a 10-year period, lessening the revenue foregone to the Federal Treasury resulting from this saving initiative.

Everyone benefits from this legislation: parents are given an incentive to plan ahead for their child's college expenses; the student is assisted in meeting the demanding costs of a higher education; the economy is strengthened through a greater level of savings; and the country as a whole prospers because these savings accounts are an investment in education.

As the mother of a child approaching college age, I am concerned about the escalating costs of a higher education. My legislation, if enacted into law, would ease that worry.●

#### U.S. PONDERS NEW MIDEAST GOALS

### HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a portion of a New York Times article entitled, "U.S. Ponders New Mideast Goals."

Shortly before President Kennedy was taken from us, he was quoted as saying to his adviser, Michael Forrestal:

I want you to organize an indepth study of every possible option we've got in Vietnam, including how to get out of there. We have to review this whole thing from the bottom to the top.

As "U.S. ponders new Mideast goals," nine American marine lads lie dead from their conspicuously unnecessary deployment in the line of fire among factions of the centuries old religious war in Lebanon.

#### U.S. PONDERS NEW MIDEAST GOALS

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan has scheduled a meeting of the National Security Council on Tuesday to decide on new American actions in the Middle East, administration officials said Saturday.

They said the actions include steps to break the impasse on a troop withdrawal from Lebanon, to engage Israel in a closer strategic relationship, to enhance American ties with pro-Western Arab states, and to offset a perceived growth in Syrian and Soviet strength in the region.

The meeting of Mr. Reagan and his senior foreign policy and military advisers follows intensive discussions on all aspects of the Middle East at the White House on Friday by Robert C. McFarlane, the special Middle East envoy, with Secretary of State George

P. Shultz, Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger and other top aides, the officials said.

On some questions, such as whether the United States should encourage or discourage further partial Israeli withdrawals from Lebanon, or whether the United States should drop its neutrality in the Iran-Iraq war in favor of a tilt toward Iraq, there is as yet no consensus within the administration, officials said. On other questions, there is general accord.

McFarlane, who helped negotiate the current cease-fire in Lebanon, returned to Washington on Wednesday and has privately recommended that the administration widen its scope of activity in the Middle East and not become bogged down in the internal politics of Lebanon, now that it looks as if the Lebanese themselves are at least discussing a new political alignment in that country.

Lebanon remains a principal topic in the administration's agenda, however, and the administration will continue to help facilitate the national reconciliation talks and will take steps to bolster the government of President Amin Gemayel, officials said.●

#### ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY DAY

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on September 15 last, Soviet dissident Anatoly Shcharansky completed the first half of his prison sentence. As Soviet law allows for a prisoner's release after this point, Gov. Mario Cuomo of New York proclaimed September 15, 1983, Anatoly Shcharansky Day in New York State as a way of appealing to the Soviets for the release of all prisoners of conscience.

Each of us, following this example, must use the passing of this landmark date—Shcharansky's imprisonment for 6½ years—as a lever to strengthen our protests to the Soviet Union for its unconscionable treatment of its dissidents.

Anatoly Shcharansky, through his steadfast resistance, has focussed international attention on the plight of Soviet Jewry. Fired by conviction, he has endured, beyond harsh prison conditions, a 4-month hunger strike in protest of his isolation. While Shcharansky's spiritual strength remains intact, his physical condition has weakened.

It is incumbent upon us to appeal persistently for Shcharansky's reunion with his family outside the Soviet Union. It is imperative that we see in this case a reflection of many others, and push for justice in every instance.

Particularly at a time that has witnessed a drastic drop in Jewish emigration from Russia accompanied by a corresponding rise in pressure put on Soviet Jews seeking to leave, our words of protest, like those of the

Governor and people of New York, must be heard.

The following is a copy of the text of the Governor's proclamation:

STATE OF NEW YORK PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Anatoly Shcharansky has been imprisoned for six and one-half years; and

Whereas, in all those years he has been isolated from his wife and his family and has gone on a four month hunger strike to protest his isolation which resulted in the serious deterioration of his health; and

Whereas, Anatoly Shcharansky is a symbol of all Prisoners of Conscience in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, Soviet Law makes it possible for a prisoner to be released after the completion of half of his sentence and, this will fall on September 15th,

Now, therefore, I, Mario M. Cuomo, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim September 15, 1983, as "Anatoly Shcharansky Day" in New York State and call upon the President of the Soviet Union, Yuri Andropov, to release Anatoly Shcharansky from prison so that he may rejoin his wife in Israel.

I ask all citizens of our State to use this occasion to write to President Andropov to appeal to him to free Shcharansky, as well as all other Prisoners of Conscience whom he symbolizes.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this twelfth day of September in the year one thousand nine hundred and eighty-three.

MARIO CUOMO.●

THE \$8.4 BILLION IMF BAIL-OUT BILL

HON. BILL PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the conference committee has not yet been appointed on the IMF authorization—H.R. 2957, S. 695 passed House amended—there has been a lot of publicity in the papers concerning the IMF. I would like to insert in the RECORD the statement of Congressman BYRON L. DORGAN that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. Congressman DORGAN eloquently expresses the very real concerns of many of us who oppose the \$8.4 billion IMF bail-out bill.

The statement follows:

We who oppose the \$8.4 billion appropriation for the International Monetary Fund have come in for some rough treatment in editorials and columns in The Washington Post. On Sept. 28, a Post editorial called us "a cuckoo alliance of the least reliable elements of the right and left, united in a dim populist resentment of the banks and isolationist hostility to the rest of the world."

We in Congress are accustomed to taking our licks from the media. But to see The Post so shamelessly misrepresent the substance of the opposition to the IMF funding—that comes as a surprise.

There may be a few isolationists among the 200-odd congressmen who will again oppose the IMF bail-out when it comes up

for final passage. But the real issue is neither isolationism nor resentment of the banks. The majority of us support the IMF. We understand that more funds will ultimately be necessary to solve the international debt crisis, and we are as interested in an orderly solution as any editor at The Post.

But how do we go about that? Do we hand over \$8.4 billion to the IMF now without addressing the bank lending policies that got us into this mess? Or do we try to set international banking's house in order before we provide the IMF funding?

Most informed observers, on all sides of the IMF debate, agree that the banks have been irresponsible. Whether a private bank should ever lend to a foreign nation—a practice that has been rare in America until recently—is questionable. Like George Champion, the retired chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, I believe the international financial system would be infinitely stronger if such lending remained the province of governments and the multilateral lending institutions they create. But that is a question that must be tackled separately.

To give the banks their due they were under tremendous pressure to make foreign loans after the 1973-74 OPEC price rise, in order to recycle billions of petrodollars that had suddenly been diverted to the oil sheikhdoms. The banks were even encouraged by our government and others. But once the banks took the plunge, prudence went out the window.

The September issue of Harper's carried a revealing article by S. C. Gwynne, describing the rabbit-in-the-hat psychology of international lending. At the ripe old age of 24, with an MA in English, Gwynne was hired by a Midwestern bank to circle the globe selling its depositors' money.

"The world of international banking is now full of aggressive, bright, but hopelessly inexperienced lenders in their mid-twenties," Gwynne wrote. "They travel the world like itinerant brushmen, filling loan quotas, peddling financial wares, and living high on the hog. Their bosses are often bright but hopelessly inexperienced 29-year-old vice presidents with wardrobes from Brooks Brothers, MBAs from Wharton or Stanford, and so little credit training they would have trouble with a simple retail installment loan."

When loans made by these inexperienced pitchmen inevitably went sour, their banks were trapped. The only way to ensure repayment—and escape the wrath of top management—was to lend more money. Between 1975 and 1983, outstanding overseas commitments by American banks ballooned from \$110 billion to \$451 billion. The nine largest American banks handed out three times their total capital to Third World borrowers.

The IMF was originally set up only to help developing countries with short-term balance-of-trade problems. Yet today we are told that with significantly increased contributions, it can manage the so-called "international debt crisis."

Some of us who have opposed the increased IMF contributions believe that it makes little sense to "worry about the fuel when the engine hasn't been fixed." The engine driving the explosion of third world debt is a western banking industry in a feeding frenzy.

Before we commit \$8.4 billion of taxpayers' money to the IMF, we should require that the banks do three things: write down the terms of their loans; set up special loss

reserves over 10 to 15 years to absorb the risk of loss on some of the loans; and accept tighter government supervision over international lending practices. After the disastrous bank failures of the 1930s, we regulated domestic banking to protect the national economy. Today we must regulate international banking, in cooperation with other nations, to protect the world economy.

The banks are already adjusting the terms of their loans, but they are increasing interest rates and charging outrageous renegotiation fees to the less developed countries. In other words, the banks are profiting handsomely from this mess, while the developing countries suffer and the U.S. taxpayer is expected to pay. That doesn't sound like economic justice to me.

If we ignore the necessary reforms and simply appropriate the \$8.4 billion, we will have bailed out the world's richest institutions, yet only swept the problem temporarily under the rug. Some argue that the administration's bill is not a bail-out of the banks, but if it is not—if the money does not go straight from the IMF to the Third World to the banks—what good is it? The entire purpose is to help debtor nations repay their creditors, and those creditors are banks.

In my state, federal bank examiners are cracking down on local bankers who have been slow to foreclose on their farm customers. In contrast, Congress is asked to bail out the big bankers whose poor judgment has brought the international financial system to the brink of disaster. The message is clear: invest in businesses here in America and you are on your own; invest in foreign countries and the American taxpayer will bail you out. This is risk-free enterprise for Wall Street, while Main Street suffers the rigors of the marketplace.

The fact is that enterprise is not free if its most powerful participants are protected from risk. Equally fundamental is the hard truth that free enterprise will not survive without some government oversight, to prevent abuses such as the stock speculation of the '20s and the lending spree of the '70s. Unfortunately, the IMF funding bill recognizes neither of these truths: it seeks to protect the bankers from loss, while failing to administer the necessary dose of regulatory medicine.

Those who describe opponents of this measure as isolationists are doing a profound disservice to their readers. Many of us who are fighting the IMF bill simply believe that you don't pay the money until the job is done, and this job won't be done until the new mechanisms to correct the terms of this debt, and the mechanisms that will prevent a recurrence, are in place.

That's the point at which I and others will support added IMF funding.●

INDUSTRIAL POLICY

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking Economic Stabilization Subcommittee, on which I serve as ranking member, is nearing the end of an exhaustive series of hearings on the issue of industrial policy. By the time the hearing process is completed,



the subcommittee will have heard from well over 100 witnesses representing Government, business, labor, and academia.

Although industrial policy advocates view the concept of explicit business-labor-government cooperation and coordination of economic activity as a creative and dynamic new way to ease our perceived economic problems—and, in some circles, as a politically popular alternative to Reaganomics—the only conclusion that can be reached from our hearings thus far is that there is very little consensus as to (a) the degree to which the U.S. competitive position is declining in an international sense, as well as the reasons for any such decline, (b) the extent to which foreign industrial policies have been and are now successful, and (c) what, if anything, should be done by government to assist the smokestack and sunrise sectors.

While I fully expect the subcommittee to report out legislation providing for a tripartite economic cooperation council and some sort of Federal credit-allocating entity, perhaps along the lines of existing proposals for a national development investment bank, the absence of any consensus on either problems or solutions means that such efforts will be based more on political than on substantive needs.

Over the next few days, I intend to insert into the RECORD several articles and editorials which outline the very serious problems with industrial policy as commonly conceived. Today, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a recent Wall Street Journal column by Art Pine, in which the myth of Japanese industrial policy is questioned.

INDUSTRIAL POLICY? IT'S NO PANACEA IN JAPAN  
(By Art Price)

WASHINGTON.—There seems to be no limit these days to Americans' fascination with Japanese imports: The paper-thin pocket calculator, the sophisticated home videotape machines, the robot that can assemble a car—all inevitably spark admiration as examples of Japanese success.

So it may not be too surprising that in a time of hardship in many domestic industries, some political leaders here seem mesmerized by Japan's widely heralded "industrial policy"—the use of government directives and incentives to help bolster important industries. The legends abound: How the powerful Ministry of International Trade and Industry masterminded and nurtured Japanese industry with subsidies and protective cartels. For years, Japan has been "targeting" individual industries, giving them special breaks to compete in the U.S. and other markets. If it works for the Japanese, proponents ask, why not try it here.

The difficulty is that unlike some Japanese innovations, Tokyo's success with a national industrial policy isn't quite what it has been cracked up to be. As numerous studies have shown, MITI often has not failed in its efforts to bolster ailing industries or spur new ones. There's a case to be made that where Japanese industry has suc-

ceeded, it has been in spite of the government's industrial policy, not because of it.

For instance, MITI planners rebuffed early efforts by Japanese auto makers to begin exporting their cars, on grounds that there wasn't likely to be much of a worldwide market for them. Similarly, government officials once tried to discourage a fledgling Japanese electronics firm from wasting its money on U.S. transistor technology, arguing the venture simply wouldn't pay. The company later prevailed. It is known as the Sony Corp.

A new study by Arthur T. Denzau at the Center for the Study of American Business in St. Louis shows MITI's efforts at management initially led to big setbacks in a spate of major industries, from autos, textiles and apparel to shipbuilding, agriculture and coal. At the same time, the Japanese cement, paper, glass, bicycle and motorcycle industries "are huge success stories, even though MITI did little to help or hinder them," Mr. Denzau contends.

In autos, for example, Mr. Denzau points out, MITI early on "targeted" the automaking business as a winner, but erred by pressing manufacturers to merge—a policy that failed over the years in the face of industry resistance. Only after 1969, when MITI finally gave up its tinkering, did the Japanese industry begin the technical innovation and aggressive marketing it needed to make inroads into overseas markets.

Paul Krugman, a Massachusetts Institute of Technology economist, makes the same sort of assessment for steel and semiconductors. While it's true that MITI "targeted" the steel industry and favored it with subsidized loans and tax breaks, the effort was thwarted by the recent decline in world steel prices, which has crimped earnings enough to make further investment unprofitable. And "the returns are not yet in" in the case of semiconductors, Mr. Krugman asserts.

Katsuro Sakoh, economist for the Council for a Competitive Economy, a Washington-based research firm, contends that Americans often seem to exaggerate the extent of the Japanese government's actual involvement in industry. "Despite the mythology surrounding Japanese industrial policy," he asserts, "the fact is that only a tiny fraction of the government's special assistance and guidance has gone to automobiles, computers and other lead industries. . . . For Japan's economic winners, government support has been insignificant. Where government has been a major investor, the beneficiaries have been losers." Calculations by other analysts appear to bear that out.

Rather, all three men—and many other U.S. economists—credit the success of Japan's manufacturing industries to a variety of other factors, most of which reflect less government involvement than in the U.S. Over the past few decades, Japan has operated with a proportionately smaller government than the U.S. and a far lower overall tax rate—leaving a consequent higher savings rate and more capital for investment. Industry has spent heavily on new plant and equipment. There are fewer restrictions on mergers and joint research-and-development. The country has a skilled, highly motivated work force. Labor relations have been better than in the U.S. Japanese businessmen have taken the export market more seriously. Industry there has maintained a firm commitment to quality control. And Japanese firms have been able to borrow technology from abroad rather than develop it themselves.

With that in mind, MITI's Mr. Krugman questions whether it's really Japan's legendary industrial policy that Americans should be seeking to imitate, or whether the U.S. instead should be trying to follow Tokyo's example in broader economic issues, such as tax and labor policy. If Washington had had an "industrial policy" in place to help the steel industry in the 1970s, he argues, U.S. firms could have built new steel plants, but they could not have made them pay, because "their labor costs would still have been far higher than those of their Japanese competitors."

As Mr. Sakoh points out, there's no disputing that Japan has made tremendous economic gains, or that it has consciously subsidized particular industries. The difficulty comes in linking the two. Americans may be looking at the wrong import. ●

## TRUMAN CENTENNIAL

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of my home State of Missouri are looking forward with anticipation to the Truman Centennial which will be celebrated next year. May 8, 1984, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Harry S. Truman.

One of the many events planned for this occasion is an essay contest sponsored by the Missouri National Educational Association, the Harry S. Truman Farm Home Foundation, and Calarimo Marble Art, Inc. of Kansas City. The essay contest represents a unique cooperative venture between educators, private business, and a non-profit foundation to commemorate a great American.

Because of the significance of this event, I would like to submit an article detailing the contest for the RECORD. It was taken from the Missouri NEA publication Something Better which has a good record of keeping our State up-to-date on current topics in education.

I congratulate the Missouri NEA for undertaking this essay contest. I am sure President Truman would have been deeply honored by such a tribute.

#### TRUMAN ART VALUED AT \$300,000 WILL BE DISTRIBUTED TO SCHOOLS

More than \$300,000 worth of Truman art will be distributed to the schools of Missouri under the auspices of an essay contest announced September 20 in Grandview.

The essay contest, honoring the centennial of Truman's birth on May 18, 1884, is designed to encourage the study of President Truman in the public and private schools of the state. Margaret Truman is honorary chair of the contest, in which students in grades kindergarten through twelve are eligible to participate.

"Every school building in the state can have a portrait of Missouri's only United States president at the conclusion of this contest," notes Missouri NEA President Lona Lewis. Three different pieces of Truman art, ranging in value from \$75 to

\$1200, will be distributed to the schools through the contest.

The art, to be hung on permanent display in the school in the name of the student who writes the school's top essay, will be presented in special school assemblies throughout the state during the week of May 6, 1984.

A new cultured marble engraving designed especially for the Harry Truman centennial was also unveiled at the news conference. Entitled "Harry S. Truman—Centennial," the first of the one thousand limited edition engravings was presented to the Truman library for display in its permanent collection.

The new engraving, by artist Al Kennedy, features a portrait of Truman at the time of his presidency, surrounded by the buildings which were significant in his life. The engraving is bordered by portraits of all the United States presidents, from George Washington to Ronald Reagan.

The Truman essay contest represents a unique cooperative venture between educators, private business, and a non-profit foundation. The contest is sponsored by the Missouri National Education Association, the Harry S. Truman Farm Home Foundation, and Calarimo Marble Art, Inc., of Kansas City.

The essay contest and the restoration of the Truman farm home in Grandview are part of an effort to observe the centennial of Truman's birth. Both activities will culminate on May 5, 1984, when the top essay writers in the state will be honored in a special ceremony at the opening of the Truman Farm Home. The top essays will be placed on display at the farm home.

The tax deductible contributions of individuals and private corporations are making the farm home restoration and the essay contest possible. Contributors of \$1,000 receive the new "Harry S. Truman—Centennial" limited edition engraving.

Further information on the essay contest is available from the Harry S. Truman Centennial Essay Contest, 612 Eastland Dr., Jefferson City, MO 65101. Phone toll free 800-392-0236. Information regarding contributions and the farm home restoration is available from the Harry S. Truman Farm Home Foundation, 12500 South 71 Highway, Grandview, MO 64030, Phone 816/761-6505.●

#### HUMANITY IN GOVERNMENT AWARD

**HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 1983*

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a man who truly knows what the word "service" stands for. Mr. Gilbert Khachadourian is this year's recipient of the Social Security Administration's Humanity in Government Award. This is no small honor when one stops and realizes that this man was chosen from the 89,000 people employed by the Social Security Administration as the person who has done the most to humanize its work.

Mr. Khachadourian came to the United States in 1949 as an immigrant from Cairo. He currently serves as the

manager for the Fresno district and branch offices of the Social Security Administration, overseeing the operation for all five locations. I am extremely proud to not only know this man, but to have a man of his dedication, integrity and caliber working with and for the citizens of my district.

For the record, I would like to insert a recent Fresno Bee article about his exemplary service.

The article follows:

IMMIGRANT IS HONORED BY HIS NEW LAND

(By Jim Steinberg)

Gilbert Khachadourian was 18 when he and his mother packed one suitcase each and left Cairo for Ellis Island, the United States and Fresno in 1949.

He also carried fluency in Armenian, Arabic, Turkish, French and English—"like breathing, nothing unusual, you learn your ethnic language first then pick up others in the street."

Khachadourian was a regular listener to Voice of America broadcasts in Cairo during the 1940s. He had no idea that, 34 years later, the VOA would interview him as winner of the Social Security Administration's Humanity in Government Award.

The annual award goes to one of 89,000 Social Security employees—and Khachadourian, Social Security district manager in Fresno, is the one.

"The award says more about our society than about me," said Khachadourian, who will be honored in an Oct. 20 ceremony in national Social Security headquarters in Baltimore.

Hands in motion, he weaved his account of a fervent patriotism that takes root with American transplants.

In fact, Khachadourian associates his concerns for Social Security clients with afternoons and evenings in Cairo. As he waited for his mother to come home, listening to the Voice of America, he longed for the day they could join family members in America.

He waited 3½ years, followed by a shorter but also difficult three days on Ellis Island, the New York receiving point for millions of immigrants.

"It was like jail. It was jail! There were guards and we could see the Statue of Liberty beyond barbed wire.

"It was mainly formality and paperwork. There were quotas. I knew 99 percent that we would get in, but there was a fear that they could send us back."

Most of the immigrants had streamed into the United States from Eastern Europe, their families and homes disrupted or destroyed during World War II.

Images from his past spice Khachadourian's assessment of Social Security today.

"You Americans born here don't have a fear of government! Most foreign-born people do. Any contact with government is a traumatic experience for them. Sometimes I have a hard time convincing the elderly: 'Hey, this is America! We are not going to put you in jail!'"

The Fresno and Madera counties district sends monthly checks to 120,000 people, about one in seven residents, and answers 10,000 telephone calls. It sends out more than \$25 million per month in benefits.

Khachadourian remembers individuals.

"A 70-year-old man came to see me from the Coachella Valley. He had been a farm laborer and had to prove his age. We helped him find records showing four days he spent

in a Sanger school, and that proved his age. Guys like that—we owe it to people. Why else is the government here?"

He told me about a young woman whose husband had died, leaving her and a 9-year-old daughter.

"Now the girl is 20, and she depended all these years on Social Security. Her mother didn't have to work and could be with her."

"That is important. After my father died, I used to wait for my mother to come home in Cairo while she held jobs like sewing. I would sit there all afternoon, waiting."

Khachadourian sees his job as supporting "people who come here with traumas—death, illness, disability, retirement. Something has happened in their lives."

They share a common problem—"how to make ends meet."

Khachadourian estimates that 98 percent of Social Security clients are thankful for benefits they receive.

"I hate to use the word 'grateful.' It's their program! They are thankful, relieved."

The district office covers 90 percent of all people working in Fresno and Madera counties. Sometimes it makes mistakes.

"We give wrong answers occasionally, and that's embarrassing," Khachadourian said. "This is a bureaucracy. We have rules—some good, some stupid. I'm sure there are cases where I, too, would be intimidated."

"But we hire people from right here, not Mars or outer space. We reflect our community."

Khachadourian offered his personal opinion that Social Security should cover all workers, and he described the latest Social Security reforms as a big step in the right direction.

The program was designed to provide partial replacement of lost earnings, Khachadourian said, but the monthly payments constitute all income for 75 percent of clients.

"I'm sure that is often not enough, but you have to balance that against what the nation can afford."

Khachadourian is sure Social Security will survive. Too many depend on it for abolition to be politically feasible. The program will continue adjusting.

Social Security is more crucial during hard times, less so during prosperous times, he said. Without it, "I think there would be riots."

Critics say government does too much for individuals. Khachadourian declined personal comment as a Social Security administrator other than in philosophical terms.

"Government has certain responsibilities," he said. "The question is how much, to what degree. I really don't have a good answer. It goes back and forth, a lot like a pendulum."

"We are public servants. The country will tell us."●

#### WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

**HON. ROY DYSON**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 1983*

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Little Flower School in Great Mills, Md., conducted an exercise in which the students were asked to state in an essay "What the Flag Means to Me." One such entry was by Danny Slade who, at the age of 9, is a fourth



grader at this school. His essay has just been sent to me by his mother, Rose, who is justifiably proud of Danny's work. I would like to offer it today for all to read.

The essay follows:

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME  
(By Danny Slade)

When I look at our flag, I feel both happy and sad. I feel happy because of our land and its people and the many freedoms we enjoy each day of our life. When I see the colors, red, white and blue, I think of faith, hope and love.

I also feel sad when I look at our flag because I think of all our people who gave us the most special gift of all, their life, so that we might have a future. I hope that each of us will have the same courage that they did.●

#### RESPONSE TO KAL FLIGHT 007 DEATHS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a thought-provoking letter from a fellow Kentuckian, Lawrence R. Borne, of Highland Heights, Ky., of the department of history at Northern Kentucky University. Mr. Borne calls for vigorous action by Congress in response to the brutal attack upon Korean Airlines Flight 007 which caused the deaths of 269 innocent men, women, and children, including our colleague in the House, Hon. Larry McDonald.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in his September 16 letter to me, and the letter follows:

NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY,  
Highland Heights, Ky., September 16, 1983.  
Representative CARROLL HUBBARD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUBBARD: The assassination of Congressman Lawrence McDonald requires vigorous action by Congress. Chang Chi Ryand, former Air Marshal in the South Korean Air Force, has revealed that he has known since 1978 (when the Soviets shot down another plane) that the Soviets have perfected a technique for throwing off an airplane's navigational equipment. This was first tested in 1978; apparently it was used again, with terrible results on KAL flight 007. The Communists intended to murder 269 civilians.

The murder of a political leader is an act of war and Congress should treat it as such. It is time for significant action—cessation of all trade with the U.S.S.R., expulsion of all Soviet diplomats from the United States, and withdrawal from the United Nations if it refuses to take action against the U.S.S.R.

You were scheduled to be on that plane. There surely is a special obligation on your part to seize the initiative and provide the leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives for action. If you do nothing, the Communists will have won a great victory; lack of action will show clearly that they have cowed the U.S. Congress. The message is obvious: expose Communist plans, as Dr.

McDonald did, and the Communists will kill you. Now the question is: are there any Congressmen who have not been cowed?

Yours truly,

LAWRENCE R. BORNE,  
Department of History.●

#### CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE CLERGY AND PARISHIONERS OF ST. AGNES ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH OF PATERSON, N.J. UPON THE CELEBRATION OF ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 22 the people of the city of Paterson, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join with Rev. John Mushinsky, pastor, and the congregation of St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church of Paterson, N.J., in commemorative services upon the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of this highly esteemed parish. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations to the clergy and parishioners of St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church in national recognition of a century of total dedication and devotion to the service of God and the cause of brotherhood, goodwill, and understanding among all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the faith and devotion of our people in a full communion of understanding, ever caring and respecting the individual religious beliefs of his fellowman has been the lifeline of our democracy—ever inspiring our people with hope and urging the individual on to great achievements and purpose in pursuing the fulfillment of his or her dreams and ambitions. The exemplary leadership and outstanding efforts of our citizens so important to our quality of life are in the vanguard of the American dream. Today we express our appreciation to the pastor of St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church, Rev. John Mushinsky, and his predecessors whose esteemed commitment and unselfish devotion in promulgating spiritual guidance, goodwill, fellowship, and brotherhood in service to God have provided a lasting contribution to the quality of life of the people of our community, State and Nation.

The quality of the leadership of members of the most reverend clergy who settled in the city of Paterson, N.J. and founded St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church is most eloquently intertwined in the history of the church which was provided me by the Centennial Anniversary Committee. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I

would like to place this statement on the history of St. Agnes Parish at this point in our historic journal of Congress, as follows:

#### HISTORICAL SKETCH OF ST. AGNES PARISH

In the 1880's Paterson was a city of 80,000 people. Main Street was unpaved and horse-drawn trolleys were the chief means of transportation. St. John's Cathedral was one of its finest structures and its Rector, Dean William McNulty, one of its most respected citizens. In the Fall of 1972, Dean McNulty provided a frame building on "upper" Main Street for the educational needs of the children in the southern portion of St. John's Parish. As the Catholic population continued to spread in greater numbers in the southern end of Paterson, the need was evident for a house of worship to be erected in that part of town. Ground was broken in the early part of 1883 and the structure was completed toward the end of the year.

The first story of the building was to provide six classrooms for the educational needs of the area. The second floor was for church services. The first Mass was celebrated on Christmas Day, 1883, and thus was born the parish of St. Agnes. Though physically situated in the City of Paterson, its membership encompassed a service area which included a large section of the City of Clifton and extended to the Essex County line.

Reverend Patrick Downes was appointed the first Pastor. His first Baptismal was administered in January, 1884, and the first marriage in the new church was held three months later. Father Downes was, as were all of his successors, a highly compassionate individual—always giving willingly and unselfishly of his time as spiritual adviser and reverend father dedicated to the well being, and happiness of each and every member of his congregation. Much progress was made in the building of St. Agnes R.C. Church during his pastorate before he passed away peacefully and serenely as he lived. Under Father Downes direction and perseverance the church rectory was built in 1888, just a few weeks before his passing.

Reverend William Corrigan was St. Agnes' second Pastor. In his dedication and commitment to help the youth of the parish to achieve leadership qualities of self-reliance, character building, sportsmanship, fair play and eagerness to serve others, he formed a social club for them. The edifice which was later to become known as St. Agnes' Lyceum was constructed under his direction to serve the social needs of the adults as well as the youth of St. Agnes' parish. The Lyceum opened in December of 1891 and flourished for many years as the focal point for the city's recreational and athletic teams.

Subsequently, Father Corrigan purchased four lots on Mary Street, Paterson and commenced the construction of a 12-room school. Upon its completion the school was dedicated and blessed by Bishop Wigger. St. Agnes' School, staffed by the Sisters of Charity, served the educational needs of the parish until it was demolished in 1974. The land where the school had stood is now utilized by St. Joseph's Hospital. Also, in 1891, the church-school building was remodeled. The second floor was removed, beautiful stained glass windows installed, pews to seat 750 erected and the renovated structure was formally dedicated as St. Agnes Church on September 6, 1891.

In July of 1897 to accommodate the growth of the parish that had taken place in the

southerly direction of Paterson, Father Corrigan purchased old Public School No. 9. After considerable renovation, the building was opened for Divine Worship as St. George's Parish in September of 1897.

St. Agnes continued to grow through the pastorates of Reverend Edward A. Kelly (1902-07), Reverend William A. Brothers (1907-08), and Reverend Edward J. Ellard (1909-14).

Reverend James MacKinson came to St. Agnes in 1914 and remained some twenty years, the longest pastoral tenure of all. In 1922, the interior and exterior of the church was completely renovated and decorated. The Lyceum, which assumed so much importance in the former days as a home for nationally famous athletic teams in the sports world, was gradually accepting its new role as a social center. The bowling alleys in the basement and its large meeting hall provided for the social and recreational needs of the people of the St. Agnes area of Paterson.

Reverend Francis McElhone came to St. Agnes in 1936 and served as Pastor until 1945. Major changes took place in the school during his time and enormous building additions with improved and modernized service facilities for the students, teachers and visitors were among his many accomplishments.

During the post World War II era, the section of the Parish in Clifton, known as the Richfield Section, was undergoing tremendous population growth. Farmlands were converted into major housing developments and on May 25, 1943, Bishop Thomas McLaughlin established the mission of St. Philip the Apostle in the Richfield Section. Its first Mass was celebrated by Monsignor William Louis on June 6, 1943. Monsignor Louis remained at St. Agnes until December 1945, during which time he supervised the construction of St. Philip's first church on Valley Road and Van Houten Avenue, Clifton.

In December 1945, Reverend Philip J. Coyne came to St. Agnes. In the near decade that he served as pastor, he served the congregation with distinction. Among his achievements he instituted many improvements in the church building and property including new stained glass windows, floor and pew improvements and installation of a new organ. The Lyceum, now condemned, was finally demolished and replaced with a Shrine to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

In June 1945, Reverend Francis Murphy was appointed Pastor of St. Agnes. Again and as always, building maintenance and renewal became the focus of the Pastor's attention. The school auditorium was remodeled with new lights and new stage. The church itself underwent extensive renovation.

A new exterior of light brick was added to the church, as well as new entrances, one on Mary Street, a new Baptistry, new and larger sacristies, replastered interior walls—to name but a few of the many building renovations that took place under the leadership of the now Monsignor Murphy with the able assistance of his curate, Monsignor Carl J. Wolsin.

Reverend James J. Daly, a parish son of St. Agnes, returned to his home parish on September 11, 1961, to the delight of his fellow parishioners, and remained here until September 22, 1966, when he was succeeded by Reverend Joseph Ducas. It was during this time that the results of Vatican II began to appear on a parish level. The old

liturgical forms gave way to the new. A new marble altar, facing the congregation, replaced the old one facing the wall, the altar rail was removed, the Baptistry was brought up to the front of the church, and the tabernacle placed in its present location and in addition a Spanish Mass was added to the Mass schedule.

Reverend Thaddeus Michota succeeded Father Ducas on August 7, 1968 and remained until December 9, 1969, when Reverend John Mushinsky, the present Pastor arrived. Through the 1960's wear and tear through tremendous use of the church facilities, especially to the school building, had taken its toll and in addition a debt had accumulated. A financial assistance fundraising program was instituted early in 1970 both for the church and the school. Before the year was over the debt was paid off and the school as well as the rectory began to receive much-needed repairs. New school windows were installed and an entirely new electrical system replaced the lone antiquated one, classrooms and hallways were renovated and a new fire alarm system which connected into the city's fire system was added.

In the intervening years, Paterson was undergoing a population shift and Bishop Casey and the diocesan school office decided to consolidate St. Agnes School into Bishop Navagh Elementary School. St. Agnes school and its property was sold to St. Joseph's Hospital.

St. Agnes School had afforded great hopes, dreams and extremely pleasant memories to countless numbers of people who had availed themselves of the educational and spiritual opportunities of St. Agnes Parish for over 90 years. The parish was left with only one building, the church-rectory. The money derived from the school sale was used to improve the remaining parish building. Air conditioning was added to the church and in the following years the entire church was renovated and weather-proofed. The rectory section of the building was also improved, restoring its original red-brick appearance and adding new windows as well as a new furnace. Reverend Nelson Betancur of Colombia, South America, arrived at St. Agnes on December 14, 1979, to work with the Hispanic community that worships at St. Agnes Church.

As St. Agnes Parish completes its first hundred years of service in the vineyard of the Lord, it can look back with a sense of satisfaction knowing that its service to the church and to our people was carried out by many dedicated people, religious and lay, with sincere dedication and devotion. As we embark on our second hundred years, we pray for God's blessings on our people and the work that is left to be accomplished through them.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of the year, the clergy and laity of St. Agnes Church have been celebrating this most important centennial history of their parish, devoting themselves in an outstanding program dedicated to the remembrance of the blessings of St. Agnes parish during the past 100 years and strengthening the resolve of all to continue their most noteworthy effort in service to God and mankind.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to seek national recognition of the distinguished pastors, associate priests, sisters, and congregation of St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church. In

their dedication and devotion to our people, in service to God, through their noble deeds and quality leadership, they have truly enriched the cultural, educational, and religious endeavors of our community, State, and Nation. We do indeed salute them and the members of St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church of Paterson, New Jersey, upon the commemoration and celebration of their centennial anniversary. ●

## IMPROVING THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 1983*

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which will contribute to the congressionally instituted efforts to bring about improvements in the criminal justice system in the District of Columbia.

In late September, Congress approved the District of Columbia Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 1984, and last week that measure was signed into law. One of the most significant features of Public Law 98-125 is a special Federal contribution of \$25 million to address identified deficiencies in the local judicial process. Most of this funding, some \$22.3 million, is directed to the District of Columbia Department of Corrections for physical and programmatic improvements in the treatment of prisoners. The remaining \$2.8 million is provided to fund seven additional Superior Court judges, plus related equipment, space and support staff. The inclusion of these additional judges will help to reduce the existing case backlog and shorten the period of time required for a case to come to trial. While it is possible for the city to immediately proceed with the utilization of the funding provided for the Department of Corrections, the related and important funding for the additional judges is made subject to the enactment of authorizing legislation.

If the efforts of Congress to improve the local criminal justice system are to have any hope of being successful, the additional judges for the Superior Court must be authorized as expeditiously as possible. The existing process of nomination, selection and confirmation will be time consuming. If there is any intent to have these additional judges in place this fiscal year, so that their impact can be felt, the authorization should be enacted prior to the expiration of this session of Congress. ●



# RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION TO JEAN JACOBS

## HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a resolution of commendation to an outstanding constituent in my district.

Whereas, the citizens of these United States should be aware of the contributions that Jean Jacobs has made to countless children and their families, and

Whereas, the juvenile institutions of this country have benefited greatly from the reforms instituted by Jean Jacobs, and

Whereas, the citizens of San Francisco and the Bay Area have looked to Jean Jacobs for her leadership and witnessed her service on numerous city commissions, boards of directors and advisory councils, and

Whereas, the occasion of the 8th anniversary of the Coleman Children and Youth Services Project which Jean Jacobs founded is a fitting occasion to recognize her accomplishments, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the 6th Congressional District hereby recognizes and salutes Jean Jacobs for her dedication to the future of our nation and our young people, and be it further

*Resolved*, That word of this tribute will be known by publishing this proclamation in the official Congressional Record of the United States.●

## CABOOL VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE BUILDING

## HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

• Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of community involvement is prospering deep in the heart of the Missouri Ozarks. The community of Cabool, population 1,848, has undertaken the task of funding and constructing a new vocational agriculture building without the use of Government assistance. The spirit that has been generated through the actions of this community, demonstrates the pride and dedication which is truly characteristic of the American way. As one local small businessman stated, "I can see that this community is already thinking better of itself because of this project. The kids that benefit from this project are our future, it we don't back them, we don't have a future." I take pride in representing this fine community and wish to recognize their accomplishments.●

# OMNI MAGAZINE AND SPACE DEVELOPMENT

## HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

• Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Omni, a monthly magazine on science and technology, with a readership of more than 5 million, has devoted its October 1983, fifth anniversary issue to space science and America's space program. Omni's editor, Bob Guccione, writes:

Science has never been more productive than in the last decade \* \* \*. Only space development, perhaps the most universally visible of all technological frontiers, has fallen behind \* \* \*. No major new space venture has been undertaken since the shuttle program was begun. It is time—long past time—for a new commitment to space.

Omni has played a large role in educating its readers on science issues and in building a constituency for science development. I want to share his point of view with my colleagues, which follows:

(From Omni Magazine, October 1983)

FIRST WORD

(By Bob Guccione)

In July of this year, NASA Administrator James Beggs announced that he expected to receive the Reagan Administration's blessing for the development of a permanent manned space station in the very near future. If Beggs is right, it will be joyous news indeed. This next step in American space development is as logical as it is long overdue, particularly since the Soviet space program continues at a pace that NASA could never have afforded even during its spirited heyday.

An official declaration of support—backed by the kind of money and materials such a vigorous program requires—would be a fitting tribute to the space agency in this, its twenty-fifth anniversary year. It would further justify the faith that moved us to create *Omni* five years ago this month.

When *Omni* was born, its editorial purpose was already as clear as its graphic beauty to give science and technology the popular voice they had never had. To help laymen experience and understand the excitement discovery and the quality of the scientific and philosophical vision that will transform the world we live in. And to do it all entertainingly, without the prohibitive technical jargon or incomprehensible diagrams so common to other science magazines of the time.

We knew, too, how to accomplish our goal, how to find writers whose own interests and knowledge brought them to the frontiers of science, who could unravel with tireless wonder and enthusiasm the complexity of startling new ideas and who could communicate that sense of excitement to others. Add probing interviews with the premier researchers and visionaries of our day. Include the finest in art and science fiction—works by such masters as Arthur C. Clarke and James Michener, Rene Magritte and Marc Chagall—because in the special philosophical alchemy of art and science one finds human truths that ordinary journalism is powerless to express. And in the end, it is the dynamic interrelationship of science and humanity that really matters.

Not at all to our surprise, however, a chorus of skeptics arose to claim that *Omni* could never survive. Science, went the universal declaration, was not "commercial" enough to support a major consumer magazine.

This, *Omni*'s fifth-anniversary issue, proves otherwise. Having more than 5 million readers per month dramatically endorses our belief that science can be as compelling as sex and as entertaining as *Real People*. This vast readership teaches us that we, editors and readers alike, can actually influence the course of human history. Five million intelligent readers, concerned with the quality of life and the future of our species, can become a formidable constituency. Five million eager minds anxious, if not determined to advance science, peace, and intellectual prosperity in our world can swing a presidential election. This is a fact the present administration might bear in mind where issues of such fundamental scientific and technological magnitude as an American space imperative are concerned.

Science has never been more productive than in the last decade; yet, five years ago, when we introduced our first issue, there were signs of trouble. NASA was entering a period of frustration as the shuttle's main engines repeatedly failed and its heat-shield tiles fell like autumn leaves. After the well-intentioned Asilomar Conference three years earlier, biotechnology was laboring under strict regulations that—needlessly, it turned out—inhibited much valuable research. The microcomputer revolution, which would help to rekindle interest in technology, was still floundering in its infancy.

The many triumphs in these fields since 1978, however, suggest that American science might be regaining if not sharpening its productive edge. Such medically important products as insulin and human-growth hormone are being produced in abundance by genetically engineered bacteria, and monoclonal antibodies promise soon to make cancer nearly as treatable as heart disease. And personal computers are appearing on almost every desk, bringing new and expanded efficiency to our daily work routines as well as to our thought processes themselves.

Only space development, perhaps the most universally visible of all technological frontiers, has fallen behind. Whereas we may have seen wondrous pictures of Saturn and Jupiter, and although the space shuttle has now proved itself capable of lifting commercial satellites into orbit, these triumphs are the work product of technology a decade old. No major new space venture has been undertaken since the shuttle program was begun. It is time—long past time—for a new commitment to space.

For a brief moment we hoped that the commitment would be made on July 4, 1982, when President Reagan celebrated the return of the shuttle *Columbia* from its final test flight by speaker of "establishing a more permanent manned presence in space." Sadly, no action has followed the President's words delivered over one year ago.

Now Administrator Beggs believes that the commitment will at last be made. President Reagan, he thinks, will finally restore a full-blown American program of space development—a program that scientifically, militarily, economically, and humanistically must ultimately represent the most profitable investment of American resources ever undertaken.

It is those principals that we dedicate this anniversary issue.●

## OLAF WIEGHORST HONORED

## HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am here to honor Olaf Wieghorst, one of the men who is most responsible for memorializing the era of the great American West. Olaf Wieghorst was an artist—a man who used his sketch pad and easel to truly capture the spirit of the West. The people in my district have recognized the contribution Olaf Wieghorst has made and are honoring him by proclaiming the week of October 24, 1983, as Olaf Wieghorst week in El Cajon, Calif.

Born in Jutland, Denmark, Olaf spent his early years traveling throughout Scandinavia as an acrobat. Because of his love for horses, he was attracted to work on a stock farm at the age of 15.

During his early years, he spent much of his time drawing and painting. His first work sold for two kroner, the equivalent of 40 cents. During this time Olaf began striving for his one goal—a life in the great American West.

He secured his passage to America by working as a cabin boy on a steamship. Once in America he set out for the West. Olaf felt that if he was to truly capture the spirit of Western life he must live, eat, and sleep it. So he worked for several years on the Mexican Border Patrol and as a ranch hand. He also traveled throughout the Old West camping and sketching the Indians there.

Olaf was truly intrigued by the beauty of the Old West and he strove to capture the wonder of it by living and working with his subjects. Olaf once stated:

If I could succeed in putting a tiny fraction of nature's wonders on canvas and into people's homes, whether they be mud huts or mansions, if that painting would add some enjoyment and pleasure to the people—if it would add dignity to the home I would feel my effort had not been in vain.

Certainly, we can see that Olaf did not labor in vain for his canvases are the historical recording of an era: The cowboy, the cowpony, and the Great American West.

And so Mr. Speaker, I call upon you and my colleagues to join me in honoring this great American. His work is well known throughout the West and his works are hanging in the White House and museums across the country. His dedication to the spirit of the West—a spirit that is uniquely American—serves as an example to all of us that the American ideal lives on.●

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MARINE CAPT. MICHAEL J. OHLER

## HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we received word of the death of the sixth marine to fall in Lebanon since our peacekeeping force entered the country.

The latest casualty, Marine Capt. Michael J. Ohler of Pensacola, Fla., grew up in my district. A member of my staff remembered Captain Ohler today as a classmate and friend, just as many others from the north shore of Long Island will recall Captain Ohler today and in the days and weeks and years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the debate continues in this city about the mission for which Captain Ohler gave his life. In living rooms and coffee shops and church halls across the country, the struggle continues to come to grips with the burden we have chosen to carry in Lebanon and the Middle East. And as we search for answers, a handful of American families gather to bury their children, and to wonder why they were taken away when their cause was honorable.

Captain Ohler had his own answers. In a recent tape to his 3-year-old daughter, he attempted to explain to her why he could not be at home with her and her mother and her 3½-month-old brother. As his wife described it, "He talked about children running from their homes between the bullet fire, trying to escape. He wanted to help those people have the same kind of peace we enjoy here."

Captain Ohler's mission in Lebanon was to help keep the peace in a country where the passions and politics of centuries have made death and destruction a painful inevitability. A friend recalled today that, as a Christian, Captain Ohler once said that if it came down to him getting killed or someone who did not know the Lord, he would prefer it to be himself.

Obviously, Captain Ohler has made that final sacrifice. Those who carry on can find hope in this situation from the knowledge that the tragic death of American servicemen has prevented the wanton slaughter of thousands whose peace they seek to protect.●

IN HONOR OF DR. PHILLIP R. PHELPS

## HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my

colleagues the accomplishments of an outstanding individual in the educational field. Dr. Phillip Phelps, the executive director of the Midwestern Intermediate Unit IV has served as an educator in almost every capacity.

Dr. Phelps began his career almost 35 years ago as a teaching principal with the South New Castle Boro School District and moved progressively upward in school administration from principal at Shenango Area Schools, assistant county superintendent of Lawrence County, chief school administrator of Lawrence County Vo-Tech, assistant county superintendent, county superintendent, to his present position with the Midwestern Intermediate Unit IV.

In times when our educational system has not been receiving many good reviews, Dr. Phelps' commitment to the field has been inspiring and encouraging. In addition to his educational contributions, Dr. Phelps has been a civic leader whose community involvements have included the Boy Scouts of America, the Lions Club and the Rotary. As his distinguished career comes to an end, he will be greatly missed by colleagues, friends, and hundreds of students he has touched over many years as a fine educator.●

## CIVIL LIBERTIES ACT OF 1983

## HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the many Members from both sides of the aisle who have lent their support to H.R. 4110, the Civil Liberties Act of 1983. This important legislation accepts the findings of and implements the recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.

This bill will, once and for all, wipe out the awful precedent of 1942. By enacting this legislation, Congress will remove the stigma of imprisonment and shame that was placed so unfairly on Americans of Japanese ancestry by the evacuation and internment.

I strongly believe that the whole package of recommendations as presented to the Congress by the Commission that it created make—as a group—a carefully constructed unified package.

The process of preparing this legislation has been a long one, and many Members have played an important part. We are all grateful to Majority Leader JIM WRIGHT for his role, and to the 74 cosponsors listed at the time of introduction. Not listed at that time thru an inadvertence was my distinguished colleague, Sidney R. Yates of Illinois. I regret this omission. No one



has worked with more dedication over more years to bring justice and fairness to the community of Americans of Japanese ancestry than Sid Yates. He has been a friend indeed.

Now, after years of work, we have a piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to consider this bill carefully. To facilitate that consideration, a summary of the legislation follows:

#### SUMMARY OF H.R. 4110

(A bill to accept the findings and to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians)

Congress accepts the findings of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians as accurate and complete. Congress acknowledges the fundamental injustice of the internment, apologizes for it, and seeks to prevent the recurrence of any similar event.

#### AS REGARDS AMERICANS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

1. On behalf of the Nation, Congress apologizes to those Americans of Japanese ancestry who were interned.

2. The President is requested to offer pardons to those convicted of violating laws during the internment period whose violation was based on a refusal to accept racial discriminatory treatment.

3. When reviewing requests for review of administrative rulings relating to the internment, executive agencies are asked to review such cases with liberality, giving full consideration to the findings of the Commission and Congress.

4. A trust fund of \$1.5 billion is authorized for educational and humanitarian purposes, and a Board of Directors is created to manage the fund.

5. Out of the trust fund, the Attorney General shall pay \$20,000 in compensation to each surviving internee.

#### AS REGARDS AMERICANS OF ALEUT ANCESTRY

1. A trust fund of \$5 million is authorized for community, educational and cultural programs benefitting the Aleuts. A Board of Directors is created to manage the fund.

2. To each of the survivors of the internment of Aleuts, \$5,000 in compensation shall be paid.

3. Churches and community centers destroyed in World War II shall be rebuilt.

4. Debris remaining from World War II shall be cleared away from the Aleutian Islands.

5. The island of Attu shall be returned to the native corporation, provided that the Coast Guard will be able to continue its use of the island.●

#### H.R. 1234

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1234, the Fair Practices in Automotive Products Act, which I reintroduced to this Congress, is due to come before the full House for consideration in the coming weeks. I urge my colleagues to read a statement on H.R. 1234 and its companion bill, S. 707, endorsed by 50 economists.

These economists believe that this bill is the legislation required to rebuild our domestic auto industry, rehire the thousands of unemployed workers and ultimately strengthen the entire economy. The statement was written by four economists: Barry Bluestone of Boston College; Prof. David Kotz of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst; Prof. Peter Phillips of the University of Utah; and Randy Barber of the Center for Economic Organizing.

I urge my colleagues to read this statement and the list of eminent economists who endorsed it:

#### A STATEMENT ON H.R. 1234/S. 707

As economists, we are concerned by the depression conditions now faced by workers in the auto and related industries. The loss of perhaps one million auto and related jobs in the past three years is causing untold human suffering, destroying families and communities. Many factors are responsible for the auto depression. One such factor is the tight money policies advocated by the Reagan Administration and its monetarist advisors and carried out by Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker. The United Auto Workers union has called for a shift to an expansionary monetary policy in order to promote economic recovery, a measure which we support.

A second cause of job loss in the auto sector is the sharp increase in imported vehicles sold in this country. As the dollar strengthened in response to the high interest-rate policy of the Fed, imports' market share grew from 18 percent of U.S. auto sales in 1978 to 28 percent in 1982. Even if U.S. auto sales do recover in the near future, the share of domestic sales produced abroad is expected to continue its rise, as the effect of imports of foreign cars is compounded by the big three U.S. auto makers' move toward "outsourcing" abroad.

In response to this structural problem, the UAW has called for new legislation to require both foreign and domestic auto giants with a large volume of sales in the U.S. market to maintain substantial production facilities in this country. The bill, H.R. 1234/S. 707 (the "Fair Practices in Automotive Products Act"), is known informally as the Domestic Content Act. It would require companies selling over 100,000 autos and light trucks annually in the U.S. to carry out a portion of their production here. The required percentage of domestic content rises with U.S. sales, topping off at 90 percent for 900,000 annual sales or more; the requirements would be phased in over four years to allow time for adjustment.

As economists who share an internationalist perspective, we support H.R. 1234/S. 707 for the following reasons:

1. The retention of a domestic auto industry is a desirable aim of economic policy. As an industry, auto production is a major market for such other industries as steel, chemicals, rubber, machine tools and high technology products. If the U.S. is to retain a viable economic base of technically advanced, high productivity, goods producing industries, then the auto industry must be preserved over the foreseeable future.

2. Unregulated trade, or the so called "free market" applied to international transactions, does not necessarily produce the most desirable economic outcomes. Sudden shifts in exchange rates or key commodity prices (such as energy) can lead,

through the unregulated market, to massive shifts in trade patterns. This can entail enormous social costs in the form of destruction of the value of physical capital (plants and equipment, transportation and power facilities, schools and shopping centers), devaluation of labor skills, and the social welfare costs of providing for the unemployed, on top of the unmeasurable human suffering that accompanies massive job loss. The "free market," by its very nature, does not account for any of these costs when there are sudden swings in trade patterns. The U.S. needs to have trade patterns which are planned and regulated. Such a system, which would be designed to take account of all costs and benefits associated with trade, would be far superior to the chaotic and distorted process of the "free market." H.R. 1234/S. 707 be seen as one piece of a desperately needed overall industrial policy.

3. A local content bill would regulate trade in autos by focusing on investment and production decisions by giant auto manufacturers, but it would leave U.S. consumers with the choice of purchasing vehicles made by domestic, Japanese and other foreign firms. This would have the advantage of maintaining competitive pressure on the U.S. auto giants to offer the types of cars that the public wants, at prices they can afford.

4. A local content bill would not be likely to cause retaliation. All other major auto producing countries limit auto imports, and many countries already impose content requirements. The major companies that would be affected by this bill are Japanese (VW already meets the bill's requirements); past experience with other countries' domestic content requirements suggests that the major Japanese producers would respond by producing here (as Honda has already), rather than trying to obtain retaliatory actions by their government against U.S. exports to Japan.

5. Any move toward directly controlling imports carries the potential by encouraging hostility to foreigners. But this bill, by calling for an investment in the U.S. by foreign firms, minimizes such overtones, and is preferable to quotas or tariffs in this respect.

6. H.R. 1234/S. 707 would regulate, to some extent, the investment activities of giant multinational auto companies, domestic and foreign. This may be seen as a first step toward democratic control over the investment activities of giant multinationals, which, if unhindered, seek to play off country against country and community against community in the search for maximum profits.

In conclusion, we support this domestic content law as a step to preserve a domestic auto sector, as a step toward planned international trade and investment that is preferable to tariffs and quotas, and as a step toward making multinational corporations—American, Japanese or whatever—more accountable to the citizens of the countries in which they operate.

#### SUPPORTERS OF H.R. 1234/S. 707

Frank Ackerman, University of Massachusetts, Economics Department.

Gar Alperovitz, Co-Director, National Center For Economic Alternatives.

Robert Aronson, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

Randy Barber, Center for Economic Organizing.

Professor Solomon Barkin, Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts.

David Blitzstein, Department of Research, United Food and Commercial Workers.

Barry Bluestone, Boston College.

Irving Brotslaw, School for Workers, University of Wisconsin.

William Burns, Research Analyst, United Food and Commercial Workers.

Martin Carnoy, Center For Economic Studies, Stanford University.

Mr. Ben Clements, Instructor of Economics, Old Dominion University.

Charles Craypo, The N.Y. State School of Industrial & Labor Relations, Division of Extension and Public Service, Cornell University.

Steven Deutsch, Labor Education and Research Center, University of Oregon.

Dudley Dillard, Professor of Economics, University of Maryland.

Peter Eckstein, Director of Research, Michigan State AFL-CIO.

Jeff Faux, Co-Director, National Center For Economic Alternatives.

Dan Fusfeld, Department of Economics, University of Michigan.

Mr. Woodrow Ginsburg, Center for Community Change.

Lenny Goldberg, Office of California Assemblyman, Tom Bates.

David Gordon, New School for Social Research, Department of Economics.

Michael Harrington, Queens College.

Bennett Harrison, Department of Urban Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Robert Heilbroner, Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research.

Suzanne W. Helburn, Department of Economics, University of Colorado.

E. K. Hunt, Chair, Department of Economics, University of Utah.

David Kotz, Economics Department, University of Massachusetts.

Robert Lekachman, New York University.

Peter M. Lichtenstein, Department of Economics, Boise State University.

Ann Markusen, University of California—Berkeley.

Mr. Ray Marshall, L.B.J. School of Public Affairs, University of Texas.

David D. Martin, Business Economics & Public Policy, Indiana University School of Business.

Ken Mericle, University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Larry Mischel, School for Industrial and Labor Affairs, Cornell University.

David Moberg, In These Times.

Leslie Nulty, Research Director, United Food and Commercial Workers.

Carol O'Cleiracain, AFSCME, District 37.

Peter Phillips, Economics Department, University of Utah.

Michael Piore, Department of Economics, M.I.T.

Michael Podgursky, Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts.

Mr. Leonard Rapping, Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts.

Michael Reich, Dept. of Economics, University of California.

Jack Russell, Office of Policy Development, Michigan Department of Commerce.

Ronald Seiber, Cornell University.

Derek Shearer, Occidental College.

Stephen C. Smith.

Hal Stack, Wayne State University, Weekend College Program.

Jaroslav Vanek, Department of Economics, Cornell University.

Paula B. Voos, Assistant Professor of Economics and Industrial Relations, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

Howard Wachtel, American University.

Charles Webster, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Research Department.

Nat Weinberg, UAW Special Projects Director, Retired.

Tom Weisskopf, Department of Economics, University of Michigan.

## CHILDREN'S TELEVISION: A NATIONAL DISGRACE

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article that appeared in the October 17 issue of Newsweek concerning the deplorable state of television programing for children.

Children are this Nation's most precious resource, and of course will be tomorrow's leaders. Yet, as this article illustrates there is "kidvid void" and children are currently being deprived of the cultural, social, and educational benefits of television programing designed for their special and important needs. Given that the average child will spend more time watching television than in the classroom by the time of high school graduation—an astonishing 10,000 to 15,000 hours with television—the lack of positive programing which is beneficial to children is even more tragic.

The Congress and the Federal Communication's Commission (FCC) have been involved with the issue of children's television for over two decades, with little to show for these efforts. In fact, it appears that commercial television programing for children is actually on a downward spiral with important shows being canceled or scaled back. Although research shows that television can positively impact the skills and behavior of children there is presently not one single regularly scheduled weekday program on commercial television designed to maximize the tremendous potential of television. I urge my colleagues to review the following article and join me in working on legislation to improve the current fare of programing for our children.

### KIDVID: A NATIONAL DISGRACE

There once was a time when the network rulers of children's television dispensed bread as well as circuses. For every zap-pow fribble, there were equal servings of socially redeeming food for thought. The networks kept that salutary balance not so much because they cared for junior America's mental health—but mostly because they dreaded the wrath of a watchful regulatory agency in Washington. Then came the reign of Ronald the Deregulator . . . and suddenly the agency stopped watching . . . and the networks were free to indulge their greed . . . and the children awoke one day to find their looking-glass world inundated by a tide of sludge.

Indeed, the state of children's programing has become so dismal that voluntary reform on the part of the networks seems the

sheerest of fantasies. Bluntly stated, American kidvid is a national disgrace. And according to most citizen watchdog groups, the blame can be traced directly to the laissez-faire policies of the Reagan administration. During the 1970s, they note, the Federal Communications Commission strongly pushed for an improvement in kidvid's air quality—even going so far as to consider mandatory programing requirements for local stations. But under Mark Fowler, the FCC's Reagan-appointed chairman and a fervent apostle of deregulation, the agency abruptly switched to a hands-off policy. From almost his first day on the job, Fowler sent a clear message: the quantity and quality of children's TV should be decided by marketplace forces rather than by government pressure.

### CANCELED

The message quickly got through, but not, perhaps, in the way that Fowler intended. Free from the threat of FCC action, the networks began unloading their least profitable kidvid offerings—virtually all of which turned out to be the best and the brightest. ABC pulled the plug on "Animals Animals Animals" and "Kids Are People Too," a pair of Emmy-winning weekend shows, while NBC phased out production of "Project Peacock," prime-time specials that explored challenges in growing up, growing old and even coping with death. CBS canceled "30 Minutes," the networks' only current-affairs show for children, and shunted "Captain Kangaroo" from weekdays to Saturday mornings, leaving the after-school time slot without a single regularly scheduled children's series.

As a result, TV's most impressionable constituents have become victims of what can almost be viewed as a form of child abuse: a weekend-morning diet that causes severe intellectual malnutrition. Consider the new fall season. Along with a record number of animated comic books, the networks' upcoming entries amount to little more than 30-minute commercials for games, toys and their own prime-time series. CBS, for example, is launching shows based on such videogame figures as "Donkey Kong" and "Frogger"; ABC is introducing the "Monchhichis," a band of monkeylike creatures inspired by the hot-selling Happiness dolls; and NBC is unleashing "Mr. T," a cartoon incarnation of its big, b-a-a-a-d A-Teamer. What makes the picture all the more bleak is the total absence of any real-life adults. In place of the Buffalo Bobs and Mister Wizards who served as socializing guides for an earlier TV generation, today's kidvid employs mythical superheroes to impart a dubious lesson even the most trivial human problems require superhuman intervention.

It's no mystery why the FCC's marketplace approach is shortchanging TV's youngest viewers. Commercial television, after all, is designed primarily as a vehicle for advertisers whose decisions are based on marketing research rather than what is best for viewers. "Children have no public voice and no independent buying power," says Peggy Charren, the president of Action for Children's Television (ACT) and the nation's most prominent kidvid crusader.

### COST

As it happens, Fowler is beginning to recognize that reality. "The marketplace may not work for children," he recently conceded. Unfortunately, the FCC chairman's suggested alternative—an annual tax on commercial broadcasters to help fund more high-quality programming for children on



public television—has been embraced by the networks as enthusiastically as they would a proposal to have Mister Rogers anchor the evening news. The networks point to cable TV as the medium best suited to take up the kidvid slack. The problem with that is one of home economics. Children's cable services like the new Disney Channel can cost subscribers as much as \$20 a month. "Relying on this technology to serve the young," says ACT's Charren, "seriously discriminates against the poor."

Forced to a last resort, ACT has carried its children's crusade into the legal arena. Last year the group sued the FCC for delaying its decision on whether to require stations to air a minimum daily amount of children's programming. Though such a requirement raises delicate First Amendment questions, Charren believes that the FCC would be within its constitutional bounds if it confined itself to mandating scheduling quotas and not program content. At least one fact seems beyond dispute: the United States remains the world's only nation that doesn't officially recognize children as a unique television audience. Even those countries with non-government-controlled TV systems similar to America's have special rules relating to young viewers. In Australia, for instance, one hour of each broadcast day is set aside as "children's time."

#### VOID

However ACT's suit is decided, the best hope of kidvid reforms may lie in the voting booth rather than the courts. Traditionally, parents have quickly figured out who's to blame for budget cutbacks that pare school lunches or economic failures that reduce housing starts. Few, however, realize the degree to which Washington policies affect what the tube offers their progeny. Peggy Charren wants to change all that. "We're going to turn this administration's negligent attitude toward the young into a presidential election issue," she vows. "When parents understand who's responsible, they'll vote in the interests of their children." Ronald Reagan has been put on notice: his much-publicized "gender gap" may soon be joined by the "kidvid void."

#### IMPACT OF CARGO PREFERENCE ON COAL AND STEEL

**HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in mid-June 1983, I asked the Congressional Research Service to evaluate the impact H.R. 1242, the Competitive Shipping and Shipbuilding Act of 1983, would have on the coal industry and particularly coal exports.

The legislation would require that by 1984, 5 percent of all bulk cargoes imported into or exported from the United States be carried in U.S.-flag vessels. Following that year, the tonnage would increase by 1 percent each year until a minimum of 20 percent is reached. Since these vessels are generally more expensive to construct and operate, some sectors fear H.R. 1242 would lead to increased shipping costs and subsequently the loss of export markets.

Following is a summary of the recently released CRS findings which came in three separate reports. I would like to commend Duane Thompson of the Environment and Natural Resources Policy Division for his work on the report, "Potential Effects of Cargo Preference Legislation on the Coal Exports Industry;" Lenore Sek of the Economics Division for her work on the report, "Transportation Costs and Guideline Rates Under H.R. 1242;" and Gary Guenther of the Economics Division for his work on the report, "Impact of H.R. 1242 on the U.S. Steel and Coal Industries."

#### IMPACT ON DOMESTIC STEEL AND METALLURGICAL COAL INDUSTRIES

Based on three possible scenarios, H.R. 1242 could increase steel output over a 15 year period from 1.5 to 2.1 as a percentage of 1979 shipment levels. In a single year, the increase could be from 0.12 to 0.16 percent. Translated into quantity of steel mill products shipped to U.S. shipbuilders, however, H.R. 1242 could create an increase of between 14 percent and 20 percent per year in steel shipment to shipbuilders over levels established between 1978 and 1982.

Currently it takes 1.392 tons of metallurgical coal to produce 1 ton of coke, an essential element in steelmaking. Based on the increase for steel described above, H.R. 1242 could increase metallurgical coal output over a 15-year period from 0.15 to 0.21 as a percentage of 1982 coal production. In a single year, the increase could be 0.01 percent.

Employment gains in the steel industry over a 15-year period could be from 1.2 to 1.7 as a percentage of 1979 industry employment. In a single year, the increase could be from 0.09 percent to 0.11 percent.

Employment gains in the metallurgical coal industry over a 15-year period could be from 0.16 to 0.22 as a percentage of 1982 industry employment. In a single year, the increase could be 0.01 percent.

The CRS report on this section summarizes and concludes with the following: "Under the most optimistic view of the shipbuilding potential of H.R. 1242, only marginal rises in demand for domestic steel—and, therefore, coke and coal—can be expected."

#### IMPACT ON U.S. COAL EXPORTS

Cargo preference could result in the loss of between 15 and 20 million tons of U.S. coal exports in 1990.

CRS used 144 million tons as the coal export level in 1990, based on Energy Information Administration data which assumes constant railroad rates. After adjusting this figure under the ICC's "revenue adequacy case," using a 71-percent railroad rate increase for 1990, there is an estimated loss of 27.2 million tons of the U.S. share of the world coal market for a new export level of 116.8 million tons.

This 71 percent increase would increase average railroad rates on export coal by \$10 per ton. Cargo preference is estimated to increase ocean shipping costs by \$6 per ton of coal. Consequently, CRS estimates that the cost of cargo preference could result in a loss of 15 to 20 million tons. As such, the U.S. coal export level for 1990 would be 96.8 to 101.8 million tons in 1990.

Employment loss due to cargo preference in West Virginia, which accounts for between 40 percent and 50 percent of U.S. export coal production, would be 9,000 direct mining jobs on the basis of a 16,000 ton loss in coal exports. The Department of Energy indicates that another 5,000 to 7,000 directly and indirectly related jobs could be lost (including mine office workers, and those in the transportation sector, mining equipment sales and community-related goods and services). However, assessments for the Appalachian coal-producing region often utilize a multiplier of 3. This would mean that for each direct job lost, there would be an additional two related jobs lost. Under the first scenario, total job loss could be 14,000 to 16,000. The multiplier of 3 scenario calculates total direct and indirect job loss as 18,000.

The CRS report on this section concludes:

It is reasonable to assume that any increase in the price of delivered United States coal will be balanced against the benefits of supply and security. As the price escalates, however, other alternatives to United States coal will become increasingly attractive. These alternatives not only would include switching to other net exporting countries as suppliers, but also switching to indigenous deposits of coal and ultimately to other fuels such as oil or natural gas. Finally, it should be said that increases in the delivered price of United States coal enhances the ability of other net exporters to extract economic rent from their shipments. It is not necessary that their price be based on cost, but only that it underbid the United States by a nominal amount.

#### ARMENIAN TERRORISM CONDEMNED

**HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a New York Times editorial condemning the acts of Armenian terrorism at Orly Airport in July, and a subsequent response by the Armenian National Committee. Many people have been justifiably horrified at the increasing number of acts of Armenian terrorism and I think this will set the record straight as to the feelings of the many

Armenians who have absolutely no connection with this terrorism.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1983]

#### SOILING THE ALTER OF FREEDOM

In the crude arithmetic of terrorism, two wrongs make a headline. An indifferent world has indeed been reminded of past Turkish crimes against Armenians by a wave of killings morally indistinguishable from the massacres they protest. To that extent, terrorism "works."

But the doctrine of collective guilt is pernicious, whether invoked by governments or gunmen. The slaughter of Turkish diplomats by Armenian guerrillas in 1983 is no more rational or justification than the slaughter of Armenians by the Ottoman regime in 1915. Murdering people because of their ethnic identity is a crime against all humanity.

Nothing can excuse the cowardly planting of a bomb at Orly Airport in Paris, which maimed 55 persons and killed 7. Nor can there be glory or sympathy for five Armenian terrorists who seized the Turkish Embassy in Lisbon, paying with their own lives and killing two innocent people as a "sacrifice on the altar of freedom." These are not political or patriotic but pathological suicides.

When modern Turkey refers to "alleged" massacres of Armenians in Turkey during World War I, it ignores a damning abundance of evidence, slanders the dead and offends a proud and long-frustrated nationalism. That is the valid grievance of Armenians around the world. It is their vigil and humanity that the terrorists now dishonor.

It may say a good deal about the motives of the terrorists that they threaten more bloodshed in France because it dares to detain the Orly suspects. For France has risked Turkey's anger with open expressions of sympathy for past Armenian suffering. The same terrorists cannot find even a hostile word for the Soviet Union, which has repressed, among many peoples, a large Armenian minority.

These few fanatics deserve the contempt of all Armenians and their well-wishers.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1983]

#### THE ROOTS OF ARMENIAN VIOLENCE

To the Editor:

No matter how strongly one may disagree with their methods (and our organization has condemned indiscriminate violence like that perpetrated by the Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia in July at Orly Airport), it serves no purpose to misrepresent the motives of Armenian terrorist organizations and to ignore the facts by suggesting, as your Aug. 9 editorial does, that they are motivated exclusively by events of 1915 and are simply killing Turks "because of their ethnic identity" in revenge for Turkish crimes of almost 70 years ago.

Actually, statements issued by these clandestine groups reveal that their acts are not motivated by revenge at all but are reactions to the policies of the present Turkish Government: its denial of the genocide, its continued occupation of western Armenia, its harassment of Armenians in Turkey and abroad and its refusal to even discuss any peaceful resolution of the Armenian question. These policies outrage all Armenians, the overwhelming majority of whom have obviously not resorted to violence but continue to actively demand some measure of justice.

In sharp contrast to modern Germany's attitudes and actions regarding the Holo-

caust, Turkey's present regime honors the memory of the mass murderer Talaat, and its diplomats have for decades been involved in a callous worldwide effort not only to deny and distort the truth about the Armenian genocide but also to block commemorations, like the building of memorials, even in the U.S. Indeed, evidence indicates that the earliest of violent Armenian actions against Turkey (in 1975) was in direct reaction to such Turkish provocations, particularly in the U.N.

Misrepresentation of the facts may reinforce the feeling that the Armenian question is shrouded by a conspiracy of silence or distortion, thereby possibly provoking further violence. Truth is critical, whether one is talking about the historic facts of 1915 or the more politically sensitive actions of 1983.

ARAM KAILIAN,

Chairman, Armenian National  
Committee, Eastern Region.

Boston, August 23, 1983.●

#### THE PLIGHT OF THE HOMELESS

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the first chill of fall weather has hit many areas of our Nation. This is an appropriate time for Congress to give thought to the plight of the neediest members of our society—the homeless. Although the problems facing homeless people are year-round problems, it is during the winter that their plight receives the most attention from the media, the public, and from policymakers. The cold weather adds another element to the potentially deadly and certainly degrading equation of homelessness. However, the causes of homelessness and the effect it has upon its victims is constant.

As a nation, our response to this scandalous problem has been one of mixed success. Many charitable, religious, and private agencies have done a splendid job in providing shelter and food. Some States and municipal governments have also met their responsibilities in an admirable manner. The Federal Government provided \$100 million for food and shelter in fiscal year 1983. These efforts have reduced the suffering of the homeless but the need remains far greater than the resources which are available.

The House can be proud of its record in this regard. On four separate occasions, this body has passed legislation which would provide assistance to non-profit organizations and local governments for shelter and food for the homeless. Most recently, the House passed legislation, H.R. 1 and H.R. 1983, which authorize \$100 million to rehabilitate existing structures for use as emergency shelters. The sad fact is that in only one instance did this legislation become law. The other body must act and the President must sign

this legislation quickly. We cannot ask the most needy in our society to wait any longer. Any further postponement will delay this assistance beyond the time of our most dire need.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor's editorial of last Friday, makes an eloquent case for the need for this program. I commend this excellent article to my colleagues' attention.

#### HELP THE HOMELESS

Homeless Americans face another challenging winter, now fast approaching. Considerably more assistance is expected to be available for them than a year ago, although specialists say additional aid is needed. And there are signs that more understanding and compassion are required of public officials responsible for their care.

One element particularly buoys those who struggle daily with the challenges of the homeless: Americans' great wellspring of compassion and love for their fellowman. It can be difficult to tap. But once Americans realize the plight of the homeless, they begin to help. Some who work with the poor note that this is a spirit of decency which can ultimately be translated into substantial assistance. Hence this alert:

No one is sure how many Americans are homeless. They're difficult to count. Most estimates range from half a million to 2 million—at least as many as a year ago, and the highest level since before World War II.

In some cities numbers are fairly exact. In New York, for instance, 60,000 homeless people were helped by public or private agencies last year; yet, since many shun such organizations, no one can be sure how many additional homeless men and women there were. One national organization that collected estimates from many communities found a consistent tally of between 1.5 and 2 percent of their population.

Nationally, about 20 percent of the homeless are families, mostly mothers with young children. About 45 percent are single adults, mostly men, often just released from mental care. Another 20 percent are runaway youths. Only some 15 percent are those generally regarded as "homeless"—drifters, alcoholics.

A troubling trend: The young are joining the homeless. Five years ago the most common age of men in New York City shelters was 55; today it is 31. For women, it then was 59; today, 22.

Unfortunately, the economic recovery has not directly helped the homeless.

This year the structure is in place to give more assistance than early last winter. A year ago as cold weather deepened, many individuals and private institutions rallied splendidly to provide shelter and to feed the homeless and other poor. In metropolitan Washington last fall, for instance, only four or five churches were operating shelters for people without a home; by winter's end, nearly 30 offered shelter, food, or both.

Most specialists say the national need far outstrips the ability of voluntary groups to meet it. The New York-based Coalition for the Homeless recently found that in 10 cities nearly all volunteer-run shelters are already full, and are turning away more people now than a year ago.

Last March the federal government moved to help: Congress and the President approved \$100 million in food and shelter costs. But the money ends Dec. 31—before winter does. Although the House of Repre-



sentatives has approved an extension, it has yet to gain backing from the Senate or the Reagan administration.

Further, organizations that aid the homeless charge that administrative regulations that accompanied the existing law have cramped their ability to spend the funds in ways to benefit the homeless over the long haul. For instance, the regulations specify that the funds cannot be used to repair or purchase shelters.

In several areas of the United States more concern for the homeless is needed. In Massachusetts only \$2,000 has been donated to a private fund the governor established to aid the homeless. In Pennsylvania, a state law last year removed some 30,000 Philadelphians from the welfare rolls and resulted in heavier summertime demand than usual for food and shelter for the homeless. And in New Jersey the governor protested when New York City sent to hotels in his state some 1,000 poor people without homes after they were displaced from their own dwellings.

Alerted, Americans, we trust, will again reach out to those in their midst needing shelter to bridge the winter.●

#### CONGRESSMAN SOLARZ ON FOREIGN POLICY

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, our colleague Mr. SOLARZ of New York gave a radio address in response to the address of President Reagan. Mr. SOLARZ has been one of the the leaders in the House—and in the country—in formulating and articulating a coherent foreign policy which genuinely advances American national security in its broadest conception. He understands that it is important that we remain vigilant to any physical threats to our security or to the security of our close allies. And he understands as well that an American policy which supports and seeks to advance basic democratic rights across the world is an important part of such a policy, and not a detraction from it. As our colleague from New York makes clear, administration policy both in Central America and in South Africa, errs in failing to understand the proper way in which America's genuine interest should be advanced.

I ask that his radio address be printed here.

#### CONGRESSMAN SOLARZ ON FOREIGN POLICY

This is Congressman Steve Solarz.

I have been asked by the Democratic leadership to talk with you today about two very important problems that go to the heart of what our country is all about and the kind of world in which we want to live.

The first involves what is happening in Nicaragua and an Administration policy toward that country which could easily involve us in a war in Central America.

Virtually everyone agrees that the Sandinista government has betrayed its commitment to open elections and a free press, and

is a source of support for revolutionaries elsewhere in the region.

The question that confronts us is what to do about it.

Most Democrats profoundly disagree with the Administration's way of dealing with the problem.

For almost two years now, in violation of both American and international law, we have been providing millions of dollars worth of arms to counter-revolutionary forces attempting to overthrow the established government of Nicaragua.

Originally the Administration told us that the purpose of this operation was to stem the flow of arms from Nicaragua to the rebels in El Salvador. But the truth is that the counter-revolutionary forces we are supporting in Nicaragua have been totally ineffective in bringing this traffic in arms to an end.

Then we were told that the real purpose was to put pressure on the Sandinistas to stop arming the guerillas in El Salvador. But when the Nicaraguans offered to do just that, if we would stop arming their enemies, the Administration didn't even respond to the Nicaraguan offer.

Someone once said about the policy of a previous American President, "It is worse than a crime. It is a stupidity." The same I fear, could be said about our policy toward Nicaragua today.

Far from ending the supply of arms to the guerillas in El Salvador, or restoring freedom to the people of Nicaragua, the President's policy has enabled the Sandinistas to justify their repression in Nicaragua; it has intensified anti-Americanism throughout Central America; and it has rendered hypocritical our denunciations of the Soviet Union for its support of subversion elsewhere throughout the world.

The Democratic party is deeply committed to policies designed to stop the spread of Communism in Central America and to promote the prospects for pluralism in Nicaragua.

But we believe the way to accomplish these objectives is not through covert military operations, which run the risk of involving American troops in a regional conflict, but through a process of genuine negotiations in which we try to resolve peacefully our differences with Nicaragua.

The second issue involves South Africa.

Here, the Administration has turned a deaf ear to the cries of 20 million South Africans who are denied their most basic human rights and freedoms simply because they are black. Instead of forcefully opposing South Africa's racist system, the Administration has adopted a policy it calls "constructive engagement" in which we embrace rather than denounce this evil.

The choice in South Africa is not, as the Administration has said, a choice between black and white. It is a choice between justice and injustice, between right and wrong, between decency and indecency.

That is why the Democratic party is determined to bring about a fundamental change in our policy toward South Africa by making it unmistakably clear that we are opposed to the apartheid system and everything it stands for.

The Congress will have an opportunity this week to reject the Administration's rapprochement with racism when it considers legislation calling for economic sanctions against South Africa.

Sooner or later, the black majority will determine the destiny of their own country. The United States will be in a far better po-

sition to have a constructive relationship with South Africa, and with the rest of the African continent, if we associate ourselves now with the aspirations of those South Africans—black and white alike—who are working for a democratic South Africa based on the principles of majority rule and minority rights.

The time has come for us to recognize that we serve neither our ideals nor our interests by trying to overthrow the government in Nicaragua or by acquiescing to apartheid in South Africa.

Let us instead resolve to remain faithful to the fundamental principles of democracy and decency on which our country was founded. We will be in a far better position to stop the spread of Communism if we promote the cause of human rights through peaceful and political means rather than by bullying our neighbors in Central America and befriending racists in South Africa.●

#### SHELTER AND COMMUNITY: AN ALTERNATIVE HOUSING POLICY

#### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, among the papers presented this spring at the Institute for Policy Studies Conference on the Federal Budget was Dr. Chester Hartman's extremely perceptive and farsighted analysis of housing programs and alternatives. Dr. Hartman, an urban planner and IPS Fellow, has advanced a number of important policy recommendations that I want to share with my colleagues. Dr. Hartman's paper, "Shelter and Community," follows:

#### SHELTER AND COMMUNITY

(By Chester Hartman)

#### WHAT IS NEEDED

The crux of the nation's housing problem is this: the costs of producing and operating housing at the quality and space standards the nation regards as acceptable are beyond the reach of an increasingly large number of Americans. The cost to the federal government of covering this gap is more than this administration is willing to pay, and more possibly than most administrations would want to pay, were we to face the problem honestly. That is, were we to take seriously the national housing goal, promulgated by Congress first in the 1949 Housing Act and reiterated in the 1968 Housing Act, of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family."

To figure the cost of making sure every U.S. household was housed in a way that met minimum local housing code standards (not the less stringent Census Bureau standards), that took the "suitable living environment" phrase seriously, and that provided subsidies to ensure that no family would have to pay an unacceptable portion of its income for housing, would produce a housing subsidy bill that would far exceed any previous federal commitments in this area. Calculations by University of Massachusetts housing economist Michael Stone suggest the housing bill alone would be along the order of \$60 billion annually in 1982 dollars. And beyond this \$60 billion figure, an un-

known amount would have to be added to provide neighborhood and environmental improvements to meet whatever reasonable set of standards were set up as part of the Congressionally mandated goal.

The reason the costs are so high is that at every point, the production and operation of housing is done with an eye to profit maximization. Beyond the cost of the materials and labor for constructing and maintaining housing, the principal factors are: land speculation, the cost of construction financing and permanent financing, the sale and resale of buildings at the highest prices possible, the operation of rental housing in order to maximize profits.

The federal government could instead use its funds and powers to reduce the basic cost of providing housing, a role that—with two major exceptions cited below—it has generally eschewed. This, or course, would represent a very different approach, one that inevitably would begin to challenge the commodity nature of housing.

This, then, is the direction in which federal policies and budgetary expenditures should move, if we are to alleviate the nation's housing crisis, or even simply keep it from getting substantially worse. Policies should be designed to reduce the cost of providing housing and to alter the system by which housing is brought, sold, and operated primarily as a commodity. Detailed programs and legislation to implement such principles can be designed if and when there is acceptance of the goals enunciated below. But I do not believe there is any possibility of making meaningful inroads into the nation's current and deepening housing crisis so long as we continue to structure programs around the principle of housing-as-commodity. We must posit instead the overriding principle that Americans have a right to be decently housed at an affordable cost and develop our approaches from that starting point.

#### DIRECTING AND RESTRICTING FEDERAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES TO NON- AND LIMITED-PROFIT DEVELOPERS AND OWNERS

The federal government's policies and expenditures could be used to control and reduce the speculative private ownership of housing, and to preserve and expand the amount of housing under permanent social or resident ownership, or public ownership with resident control. There are now different types of housing ownership and control that have been used successfully in many parts of the country to eliminate speculative operations: non- or limited-equity cooperatives; community development corporations; church-, union- or other nonprofit-sponsored developments; resident-owned partnerships and corporations; ownership by public bodies. Under such arrangements, the primary motivation for being involved in the housing business is to provide the best housing services possible at the lowest costs to the residents. Private resale of housing is prohibited entirely, or sales prices are limited to the original purchase price (or share, in the case of a cooperative), plus some increment to take into account—fully or partially—intervening inflation. A federal policy to provide housing construction and rehabilitation subsidies only to non-speculative, socially motivated developers would encourage such enterprises and gradually build up the stock of housing that is permanently outside the commodity sector. Since sensitive, responsive housing management is by no means ensured simply by virtue of nonprofit ownership, adequate provision must be made for resident control

of management policies. Subsidies must be adequate to permit proper maintenance and periodic modernization, and residents' costs must be commensurate with their true abilities to pay. The nonspeculative principle can be applied to individually owned housing as well, by requiring resale price controls as a quid pro quo for receipt of federal subsidies.

#### RESTRICTING PROFIT-MAKING IN EXISTING HOUSING

With regard to existing housing, federal subsidies and incentives could be directed toward encouraging social, nonspeculative ownership as well. Low-interest rehabilitation loans and grants could be limited to nonprofit developers/owners. And federal incentives could be used to encourage state and local governments to control speculation in the housing market. Legislation that almost passed Congress recently would have restricted federal housing and community development subsidies to communities that did not have effective rent control ordinances. This would have been a way of using federal leverage to dissuade local city councils and electorates from passing measures that interfere with the workings of the private real estate market. The "theory" advanced for such a measure was that these controls dampen real estate activity, and federal aid to areas that inhibit "healthy" real estate markets in counterproductive. A more compelling line of reasoning would be that pouring federal housing subsidies into an unregulated real estate market can only increase the amounts of subsidies needed and divert a substantial portion of these subsidies into the pockets of those who least need them—private profit-oriented developers and owners. Instead, the federal government ought to limit its housing and community development subsidies—or at least give preferential treatment—to those communities that have acted to regulate private real estate activities so as to reduce the cost of housing. Communities can do this by passing ordinances that limit rent increases, end arbitrary evictions, deny demolition and conversion permits to those who would remove needed housing from the stock, ensure compliance with local housing codes, and use local means (such as real estate transfer taxes) to reduce housing speculation.

#### REVISING THE TAX SYSTEM TO DISCOURAGE PROFIT-TAKING FROM HOUSING

A further step would be to revise federal tax policies to encourage more socially responsive use of the existing housing stock and development of nonprofit forms of housing ownership. At present, our tax laws make virtually no distinction among different kinds of housing activities, according to purpose or sponsorship. Interest payments are deductible regardless of how much they amount to, how many houses one owns and occupies. The tax shelter game—shielding real income from taxation by offsetting it against artificial "book" depreciation losses on rental properties—is a massive loophole, useful only to the rich. (The exception to this involves community groups that have been able to benefit by syndicating these depreciation losses and selling them to wealthy investors. The groups then use the cash to provide housing and other benefits to the community—an ironic situation in which the poor get housing benefits only by allowing the rich to escape their rightful tax obligations.) Federal tax policy regarding housing investment and operation could be structured to achieve social goals. The

government could make rehabilitation and development incentives available only—or on more attractive terms—to those who produce housing that is permanently placed outside the speculative sector.

The other main area of federal tax policy that needs fundamental restructuring is the home ownership deduction, the ability to deduct all mortgage interest and property tax payments from taxable income. Together, these tax expenditures are estimated at \$39 billion in fiscal 1982, \$48 billion in fiscal 1983.

#### PROVIDING HOUSING CAPITAL DIRECTLY TO REDUCE DEPENDENCE ON MORTGAGE FINANCING

The federal government also could play a key role in making available the capital needed to construct and rehabilitate housing. The high cost and unavailability of private mortgage credit have been two major hindrances to achieving the national housing goal. Structuring housing finance—for construction and purchase/repurchase—around mortgage credit builds into the permanent cost structure of housing a massive socially wasteful component (which can comprise about half of the average home owner's or renter's monthly costs). Housing is the only commonly used consumer item that increases rather than decreases in value over time. And each time it is sold, the mortgage needed to finance the purchase is larger, and usually carries a far higher interest rate than the previous financing. This is a permanent burden, passed on to each successive housing consumer. Eliminate mortgage financing, and the ongoing costs to the housing consumer—for maintenance, utilities, property taxes, insurance, etc.—are permanently reduced by roughly one-half.

Public housing and military housing are the two major examples of housing in our society that is not built with mortgages and does not get sold and resold with the requirement of subsequent mortgage financing. Military housing is built with direct capital grants from the Department of Defense budget. Public housing is built with construction funds raised by bonds issued by local housing authorities, which in turn are backed by a federal commitment to repay these bonds; the housing is owned by the local authority. Neither type of housing is treated as a commodity (unless it is eventually resold in order to move it outside the publicly owned housing stock).

#### ALLOCATING HOUSING CREDIT TO PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES

The federal government could also regulate the activities of lending institutions—through the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Comptroller of Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Bank—to ensure that priority in the allocation of mortgage credit is given to productive activity rather than to shuffling existing properties to maximize profits. Specifically, if there is a choice between making mortgage money available to build or rehabilitate housing or making money available to refinance, trade, or speculate in existing housing or to convert rental units to condominium ownership, the federal government, through its regulatory activities, should ensure that scarce mortgage funds go not necessarily to what is most profitable, but to what is most socially useful.

#### ALLOCATING LAND ON THE BASIS OF SOCIAL USE RATHER THAN PROFIT MAXIMIZATION

Land is another major factor in housing production and costs, and the federal gov-



ernment should act to ensure its availability for socially beneficial purposes. Land speculation is an activity that is not in society's interest. It raises the price of a scarce commodity and of what is built on that land. It passes on to users substantial, long-term costs in order to allow profits to be made by the speculator, whose only interest is in profit maximization. Of housing prices are to be lowered, one important step is to bring under control the cost of land on which housing is built. This cost currently accounts for 24 percent of the total production costs of the average new single-family house. (And since mortgages are taken out on the price of the land as well as structure, these costs are considerably greater over the long run, when long-term interest payments are added.)

Bringing land prices under some form of social control or putting the land itself under some form of social ownership is a key step. One way of doing this is through community land trusts. These are nonprofit corporations chartered to hold land in the best interests of the community. Land that a trust purchases or receives by donation is never again resold: it is permanently taken off the speculative market. Directors of the trust, elected by the community, make decisions on how the land will be used. Users obtain a lease, usually for 99 years, that is renewable, and also inheritable. The person leasing the right to use the land must be the actual user; he or she cannot be an absentee, subleasing or otherwise controlling how another person uses it. The user has all the other rights and security that owners traditionally have. For example, he or she can sell improvements, but under certain controls and with price limits. Considerable tax advantages are available to those who donate property to such trusts, and additional tax incentives could be created to induce owners of land and buildings to make such donations.

Federal funds could be assigned to community land trusts so they could purchase land for development. Housing development on trust land would, of course, be bound by the nonspeculative agreements that are at the heart of such arrangements. Successful land trust ventures have already been launched in Cincinnati, Washington, D.C., and Minneapolis, with respect to housing, and the arrangement has also proved itself in efforts to preserve farmlands. Cooperative ownership of land (analogous to housing cooperatives) is another device that could be aided by federal programs.

"Land-banking" is an additional promising mechanism. A local, metropolitan, regional, or state agency can use federal funds to purchase vacant land—on the open market or through tax foreclosure sales. This land then can be allocated to nonprofit housing developers at a reasonable price (perhaps for free, as a way of reducing final housing costs) and with controls requiring that the housing remain permanently outside the commodity sector.

#### MAKING HOUSING AVAILABLE ACCORDING TO NEED

With respect to the widespread incidence of housing discrimination against minorities, women, large families, and other groups, the federal government clearly must play a more active role in enforcing existing civil rights statutes. Publicity, "testers" (matching white and minority home and apartment seekers sent to the same unit within a short time of one another), administrative procedures, litigation, and federal funds must be used to reward nondiscrim-

inatory behavior and punish discriminatory behavior. Discrimination must be fought not only on a case-by-case basis, but also systematically. Government funds must not be used to break up socially and politically cohesive, supportive minority communities; instead, they should be used to revitalize and strengthen them for existing residents. Concomitantly, the range of housing options available to people must be expanded through creative use of government programs and funds. The government must also assist in the development of housing of appropriate size, type and design, with appropriate community facilities, to help free women from the various forms of domestic oppression and exploitation.

#### DRAMATICALLY INCREASED FEDERAL HOUSING OUTLAYS

The level of government expenditures on housing problems is perhaps the central issue. Housing is inherently expensive, the largest single expenditure in most households' budgets, the most costly capital good most people will ever own or occupy. Given the widening gap between housing costs and people's ability to pay these costs, we must agree to large government allocations to the housing area if we are serious about making sure that everyone in America is decently housed. Alternatively, if we were to provide everyone with a decent wage or guaranteed income, the amounts needed to subsidize housing would be drastically decreased. But since we have neglected and shortchanged this area for so long, we have a lot of catching up to do. The \$60 billion (1982 dollars) annual subsidy level that has been posited to do the job right is vastly more than the federal budget now allocates directly to housing, but only about 2 percent of the gross national product, one quarter of the 1983 military budget, not too much more than the \$48 billion in home owner tax expenditure subsidies estimated for fiscal 1983, and about what home owner subsidies are expected to be in fiscal 1984.

In sum, the housing issue is a basic test of the values and priorities of our economic system, and of how well it is working. We are rapidly falling behind in terms of our ability to house people decently, in satisfying environments, at costs they can afford. A restructuring of federal budget priorities is called for, not only to increase our resource commitment to housing and communities, but to reformulate the approach that the government and society should take toward the housing problem. This new approach requires "decommodification" of housing—creating an alternative model and a different set of financing and operating mechanisms that treat housing as a use good and not something whose function is to maximize profits for its producers and owners.●

#### THERE IS NO HIT LIST PUBLISHED BY NEA

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a reporter obtained a copy of an internal interim progress chart on voting records of Members of Congress. The information was compiled by a member of the political staff of

the National Education Association as just one part of an entire notebook of preliminary data prepared for NEA's leadership.

In point of fact, a lead page in that notebook stipulated the following:

Because the first session of the current 98th Congress is not scheduled to complete its work until October 28 and a number of critical issues will be coming up for a vote, we need additional time to obtain a better assessment of the incumbents' voting record.

In spite of this statement in the notebook, subsequent news articles and reactions referred to a supposed NEA hit list of incumbents. This concept apparently resulted from NEA's preliminary listing of partial records of incumbents in House and Senate seats to be contested in 1984.

I have inquired into the basis for this preliminary chart and found that the initial listings were arrived at differently for the Senate and the House. Members of the Senate whose seats are up in 1984 were classified on the basis of a preliminary assessment of their votes over the last 5 years. Members of the House were classified based on only two votes. In addition, NEA still has not decided whether either or both votes cited in this preliminary chart actually will be among the votes included in NEA's final assessment.

The two votes cited were our vote on the first budget resolution, which contained proposed additional funding for education, and a vote on social security. It is my understanding that a vote on the social security issue likely will be included in NEA's final report card assessment and published for its membership, but the specific vote cited in the preliminary study probably will not be the actual vote selected. The social security issue was picked, I am told, because of its major impact on retirement for educators. I do not question at all that educators ought to be concerned about issues that may affect their retirement. I believe they ought to make a decent living while they work, and the teaching profession is underpaid today. The NEA's concern that educators be able to live decently and with dignity after retirement is commendable.

In any event, reports of the hit list received wide publicity in various parts of the country. The wide publicity received has stemmed primarily from the fact that NEA is both the largest professional organization and the largest union in America, as well as the publicity that NEA has received in recent years because of the effectiveness of its political action efforts, and the political impact generated by use of the term "hit list." The reality, however, is that the so-called list does not exist.

NEA has long kept records of how Members of Congress vote on issues of concern to its Members. However, no

complete summary of incumbents' voting records for the 98th Congress has as yet been compiled, much less submitted to NEA's leadership and political action arm—NEA-PAC. As the report delivered to the NEA-PAC Council on September 29 states, compilation of the NEA's report card on this first session of the 98th Congress must necessarily await the events and votes of the remainder of this session.

When that summary is prepared, it will help provide NEA's membership with important information to which they have every right as they participate in our Nation's political process. If this Nation's teachers are to teach their students that it is the civic responsibility of every American to participate in our political process, then surely they should do so themselves. All Americans should be urged to be involved in our political process, to learn of the issues, and to participate in election activities.

Support for and improvement of American public education ought to be a top priority of this Congress and of our National Government. In turn, our positions and votes on proeducation issues should be a serious consideration when Americans make up their minds about which candidates to support on election day.

Let me point out that, in NEA's system, key issues are established by the members through the representatives they elect to NEA's annual representative assembly. Further, recommendations for endorsement are made by the affected State affiliates. It is a simple, straight-forward, democratic process. Eventually, based on a thorough review of the record and interviews with the candidates, NEA-PAC will have a list of official endorsements—including candidates endorsed and, by implication, candidates opposed. I would not call the results of such a process a hit list but at least it will be an official NEA list and all can deal with it when it is presented. Such a list will reflect the views and concerns of NEA's 1.7 million members, whose political and legislative goals and priorities focus on support for America's time-honored system of universal, tuition-free, quality public education at the elementary and secondary levels. Those goals and priorities also support our quest for justice, equality and peace for all who live in our great Nation. I certainly agree with such lofty and vital goals and priorities.

NEA's process is comprehensive, open and reflective of the concerns of our Nation's educators. I hope this information will help clarify the facts about NEA's process. ●

## WE MUST NOT ALLOW A WATT CLONE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am curious as to the motives of this administration in the appointment of William Clark as Secretary of the Interior.

We have just spent almost 3 disastrous years with James Watt as Secretary of the Interior, a man whose entire program was based on the concept of selling off or giving away the natural treasures of this country and encouraging the commercial exploitation of the parks and wilderness areas that are left.

We are now faced with a man who has absolutely no experience in conservation of natural resources, whom the President introduced as qualified not for his relevant experience or conservation commitment, but for his religiosity and his status as a Westerner and rancher. As a judge on the California Supreme Court he dissented from majority decisions to uphold laws to protect the environment in every case except one. This is not a man that will protect our natural resources.

Let Judge Clark be on notice that, if he is confirmed by the Senate, the U.S. Congress will not stand for a James Watt clone. We will not stand for continuing the despoliation policies of James Watt. We will not stand for continuing the environmental degradation that appears to be the goal of the administration.

We wish to remind Judge Clark that in spite of the fact that he may not be as flamboyant as Mr. Watt, we will be watching.

I wish to commend the following article to my colleagues attention. It appeared today in the New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1983]

CLARK'S LOW WATTAGE

(By John B. Oakes)

"There you go again," Ronald Reagan.

It didn't seem possible for you to appoint a Secretary of the Interior less fitted for the job than James G. Watt. But now you've done it.

Once again, you've baffled your critics by accomplishing the impossible. You have found someone with even fewer qualifications than Mr. Watt to be chief guardian and conservator of the nation's diminishing natural resources.

To pull you out of the hole Mr. Watt had dug for you when he was forced to resign the other day for the wrong reasons, you turned to your crony and national security adviser, William P. Clark. At the same time, you were able to pull Mr. Clark out of the hole he had dug for himself.

In truth, he has no more qualifications for his second job than he had for his first. As you sprang the news of his appointment to

a group of women evangelicals, even you could think of no better justification than that he is a "God-fearing Westerner, fourth generation rancher and a person I trust." Unfortunately, that's not enough.

If this dubious accolade means anything, it means that Mr. Clark has no more competence on public land-use issues than he has shown up to now on foreign issues, in which he has already proved his abysmal ignorance. His nomination as Interior Secretary is an insult to the American people, even more so than was that of his predecessor.

Mr. Watt at least had extensive experience in the field of natural resources—though he was invariably on the wrong side—and first-hand knowledge of what the Interior Department is all about.

Mr. Clark has not even rudimentary understanding of this huge and powerful department of Government that he is now supposed to administer. It is responsible for the protection, conservation and wise use of more than 600 million acres of publicly owned lands with major forest, mineral, grazing, water, farming, wildlife and wilderness resources at stake. Since Mr. Clark has virtually no background on the subject—except possibly for the ranching business, which for generations has been one of the most notorious exploiters of the public lands—it is inconceivable that the Watt-filled hierarchy of the department would let him materially alter existing policies, even if he wanted to.

The one thing that will change will be Mr. Watt's confrontational style. Even that is no plus. One of the few advantages—perhaps the only one—of his tenure was that he was so much the arrogant dogmatist, so defiant of Congress and contemptuous of the law that he became an easy target.

With his low-key manner, Mr. Clark will be harder to stop from carrying out precisely the same policies. Therefore, the thing to do is to stop him now.

It will be difficult for any Senator—Democratic or Republican—to justify a vote to confirm Mr. Clark's nomination. It will be difficult unless that Senator is willing to concede that the President has absolute power over his Cabinet appointments and that the constitutional provision mandating a sharing of the appointment power with the Senate is in fact a dead letter. No Senator, Republican or Democrat, can seriously believe that Mr. Clark—however much he may be a "prince of a fellow," as Mr. Watt describes him—is an appropriate nominee for that post.

Mr. Watt wasn't either, but for different reasons. It is ironic in the extreme that he has been forced to resign because of a distastful (if revealing) remark made in jest, but one that could be used politically against him and the President whom he represents. The shallowness of American politics could hardly be better demonstrated than by this incident. The Senators who were scared into demanding Mr. Watt's resignation because of his politically loaded attempt at humor would have served their country better had they insisted on his dismissal long ago because of his policies. Though personally honest, Mr. Watt has presided over the most destructive giveaways of America's publicly owned natural resources to private interests since Teapot Dome, and proved himself the most dangerous Interior Secretary in the department's history.

Giveaways of timber, giveaways of coal,



giveaways of offshore oil, giveaways of grazing rights, giveaways of water rights, giveaways of park lands, wildlife and wilderness areas—coupled with budgetary manipu-

lations and revisions of internal regulations to undercut protection of longrange environmental values: These are the hallmarks of the Watt administration.

If Mr. Clark is confirmed, the style will be very different from that of Mr. Watt, but the results will be worse, because Mr. Clark won't even know what he's doing. ●